THE ENGLISH CHURCH

FROM THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE I. TO THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1714-1800)

BY THE LATE

REV. CANON JOHN H. OVERTON, D.D.

AND THE

REV. FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1906

All rights reserved

SHL
WITHDRAWN
BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

IN · PIAM · MEMORIAM

IOHANNIS · HENRICI · OVERTON · S.T.P.

QVI · OPERIS · IAM · IN · LVCEM · PRODEVNTIS

FORMAM · RATIONEM · EXPLORAVIT · PROVIDIT

HOS · QVALESCVNQVE · STVDIORVM · ILLIVS · FRVCTVS

DEDICAT

DISCIPVLVS · AMANTISSIMVS

INTRODUCTION

INTEREST in the history of the English Church has been steadily increasing of late years, since the great importance of the Church as a factor in the development of the national life and character from the earliest times has come to be more fully and clearly recognised. But side by side with this increase of interest in the history of our Church, the want has been felt of a more complete presentment of it than has hitherto been attempted. Certain portions, indeed, have been written with a fulness and accuracy that leave nothing to be desired; but many others have been dealt with, if at all, only in manuals and text-books which are generally dull by reason of excessive compression, or in sketches which, however brilliant and suggestive, are not histories. What seemed to be wanted was a continuous and adequate history in volumes of a moderate size and price, based upon a careful study of original authorities and the best ancient and modern writers. On the other hand, the mass of material which research has now placed at the disposal of the scholar seemed to render it improbable that any one would venture to undertake such a history single-handed, or that, if he did, he would live to complete it. The best way, therefore, of meeting the difficulty seemed to be a division of labour amongst several competent scholars, agreed in their general principles, each being responsible for a period to which he has

devoted special attention, and all working in correspondence through the medium of an editor or editors, whose business it should be to guard against errors, contradictions, overlapping, and repetition; but, consistency and continuity being so far secured, each writer should have as free a hand as possible. Such is the plan upon which the present history has been projected. It is proposed to carry it on far enough to include at least the Evangelical Movement in the eighteenth century. The whole work will consist of seven[1] *crown octavo books uniform in outward appearance, but necessarily varying somewhat in length and price. Each book can be bought separately, and will have its own index, together with any tables or maps that may be required.*

I am thankful to have secured as my co-editor a scholar who is eminently qualified by the remarkable extent and accuracy of his knowledge to render me assistance, without which, amidst the pressure of many other duties, I could scarcely have ventured upon a work of this magnitude.

W. R. W. STEPHENS.

THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER,
20th July 1899.

[1] *An eighth volume dealing with "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century" has since been added.*

According to present arrangements the work will be distributed amongst the following writers:—

I. The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest, by the Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt. *Ready.*

II. The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I., by Dean Stephens, D.D. *Ready.*

III. The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, by the Rev. W. W. Capes, M.A., late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. *Ready.*

IV. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary, by James Gairdner, C.B., Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh. *Ready.*

V. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., by W. H. Frere. *Ready.*

VI. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne, by the Rev. William Holden Hutton, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. *Ready.*

VII. The English Church from the Accession of George I. to the End of the Eighteenth Century, by the late Rev. Canon Overton, D.D., and the Rev. Frederic Relton, A.K.C. *Ready.*

VIII. The English Church in the Nineteenth Century, by F. W. Cornish, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. *In preparation.*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/englishchurch0000revc

PREFACE

When Canon Overton died he left behind him the rough draft of this volume. It was contained in three small octavo note-books, and written in pencil. There were a few notes on the opposite blank pages as to amplifications or modifications to be made in the final revision, and references to quotations from his own or other books which he intended to insert in full. These quotations for the most part, owing to considerations of space, it has been found necessary either materially to curtail or altogether to omit. What would have been the ultimate form in which his book as thus planned, partly on paper and partly only by reference, would have been sent by him to press it is impossible even to conjecture. The plan on which he had worked was unfortunately not that of the other volumes of this series. It comprised four long chapters, dealing with the four periods into which he divided his work, and supplemental chapters on General Church Life, Missionary and Colonial Work, and the relations with Sister Churches. The difficulty that I had to contend with all through has, therefore, been to preserve so much of his work as was possible, and in the order in which he had sketched it, and at the same time to break it up into a number of short and more or less self-contained chapters. Canon Overton, moreover, had not, in this instance, departed from his favourite method of writing history, namely, that of dealing with the lives of the great men of the

time rather than writing a consecutive narrative of events and tendencies. It was found impossible, without so obliterating his work as to make the retention of his name as joint-author an anomaly, to depart from this method. What has been done is to add to his material certain sections with which he had either not dealt at all or but only partially, and in some cases to rewrite whole sections, retaining his phraseology wherever possible, and modifying his order and arrangement. I have not willingly parted with a line, scarcely a word, of what he had written. As the work now stands, therefore, it is a distinctly composite production. Some is wholly his, some wholly mine, and the able hand of the Editor has been exercised freely on both. I am solely responsible for the lists of Authorities at the end of the chapters. I could not now, without reference to the documents in their respective stages, distinguish always accurately between these three, and the "higher criticism" would fail to disentangle the various contributions of O. and R. and H. I did make a rough calculation of the relative amount of each, and it might be expressed by the formula $O_{24}R_{14}H_2$.

Since Canon Overton and his colleague C. J. Abbey first drew the attention of the thoughtful to the problems of our eighteenth-century Church life, a gradual change has come over our judgments upon it. The more it is studied the more full of life it is found to be. Not perhaps our kind of life, but life nevertheless. Every investigation that is made into the annals of a diocese or a parish reveals this more and more. The day is not yet when the full history can be written. Much spade work has still to be done before the foundations can be fully explored. Local and diocesan records need to be investigated and their results tabulated before any trustworthy verdict can be pronounced upon the religious life of the Church as a whole. Overton's and Abbey's work was pioneer work, and much more of the same kind is required.

In one respect a very severe restraint has had to be

exercised. Tempting and congenial as the subject is, there was no space in which to treat of the secular literature of the time. The poetry, the essays, the novels especially, have been passed over, though their influence upon the thought and life of the age was enormous. Chapters might be written thereon. The contemporary life of the Church of Ireland was sketched by Dr. Overton, but that too had to be omitted.

I have to thank my eldest son, the Rev. B. F. Relton, B.A., late Scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, for invaluable help in the way of research and verification, without which the growing claims of a town parish would have prevented my making much progress. To the Rev. Dr. Hunt I must express my deep sense of obligation for much guidance and patience. I can only conclude in the words of one whose life began towards the close of the century—

> "What is writ is writ;
> Would it were worthier."

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

FIRST PERIOD, 1714–1738

CHAPTER II

THE BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY AND THE SILENCING OF CONVOCATION 11

CHAPTER III

THE TRINITARIAN AND DEISTIC CONTROVERSIES . . 30

CHAPTER IV

THE ANSWER TO DEISM 40

CHAPTER V

JACOBITES AND NON-JURORS — BEGINNINGS OF SPIRITUAL REVIVAL 57

SECOND PERIOD, 1738–1760

CHAPTER VI

PAGE
THE EARLY PHASES OF THE WESLEYAN MOVEMENT . . 72

CHAPTER VII

POTTER, GIBSON, AND SHERLOCK 90

CHAPTER VIII

BENSON, BUTLER, AND SECKER 107

CHAPTER IX

BISHOP WILSON 125

CHAPTER X

THE LATER WORK OF WILLIAM LAW—THE EARLY EVANGELICALS 137

THIRD PERIOD, 1760–1789

CHAPTER XI

WARBURTON, HURD, AND LOWTH 158

CHAPTER XII

THE EVANGELICAL CLERGY 173

CHAPTER XIII

MINOR CURRENTS UP TO 1789 197

FOURTH PERIOD, 1789–1800

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE
General Influences—The Growth of Toleration 218

CHAPTER XV

The Later Evangelicals 230

CHAPTER XVI

Closing Years of the Century 251

CHAPTER XVII

General Church Life 267

CHAPTER XVIII

Church Fabrics and Services 287

CHAPTER XIX

The Sunday School Movement 298

CHAPTER XX

Colonial and Missionary Work 306

CHAPTER XXI

Relations with Sister Churches 346

APPENDIX I 359

APPENDIX II 361

INDEX 363

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE time is now past when the period from the death of Queen Anne down to the end of the eighteenth century, if not to the beginning of the Oxford Movement, was regarded as practically a blank page in English Church history. It has at last been recognised that a period which produced such clergymen as Joseph Butler and Daniel Waterland, William Law and Samuel Horsley, and such lay churchmen as Edmund Burke and Samuel Johnson, William Wilberforce and William Stevens, must have been at any rate a period worth studying. It is true that a lover of the English Church cannot study it without a blush. It is a period, for instance, of lethargy instead of activity, of worldliness instead of spirituality, of self-seeking instead of self-denial, of grossness instead of refinement. There was a grovelling instead of a noble conception of the nature and function of the Church as a Christian society, an ignoring instead of a conscientious and worthy carrying out of the plain system of the Church, work neglected instead of work well done. All this meets him at every turn.

Revised estimate.

General characteristics.

But there is another side to the picture. The enemies of the faith from all quarters were fairly grappled with and fairly vanquished by its defenders. Never, perhaps, during the whole course of English Church history was the victory in such contests so obviously on the Christian side. If the general type of character was, on the one hand, coarse and gross, it was, on the other hand, manly and robust; moreover, if the majority were "of the earth, earthy," the

Apologetics.

minority afforded some of the noblest specimens of the Christian character the world has ever seen; and finally, the history is, as a whole, the history of a rise, not of a fall; of a rise so gradual as to be almost imperceptible, so slow that when we come to the end of the period we do not seem to have risen very much above the level from which we started, but still distinctly a rise. The study of it, therefore, is encouraging, and not depressing. We close the page with a sure conviction that better times were at hand. And the event proved that this was in fact the case.

Ecclesiastical history.

If it is true that the "eighteenth century is the best period from which to begin the study of contemporary English history," to no department of our history does this saying apply more forcibly than to that of the English Church. That sober and somewhat inelastic spirit which to this day forms alike the strength and weakness of the Englishman is really a survival of the spirit which found its expression in the abhorrence of what used to be called "enthusiasm," and which must still be reckoned with in the introduction of any innovation either in Church or in State, and especially in the Church. It did not exist to anything like the same extent before the eighteenth century, which this volume covers; and so by making a leap, say, from the Caroline to the Oxford divines, we miss the clue which guides us to a right understanding of many a problem in later Church history. The feeling which stigmatised Bishop Butler as "a papist" because he put up a cross of white marble above the altar in his palace chapel at Bristol, where it remained until it was destroyed with the chapel and palace during the Reform riots in 1831; and because he dwelt on the importance of "external religion"; and which dubbed Bishop Beilby Porteus "a Methodist" because he strove to revive the observance of Good Friday, has by no means died out. A prosaic element was introduced into English theology in the eighteenth century, and it has continued prosaic ever since. To this very day the writings of such men as Henry More, John Smith, William Law, in his later stage, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, apart from his poetry, and others who represent the Platonic as distinguished from the Aristotelian type of

A transition period.

mind, the mystical as distinguished from the practical temperament, have never been popular in England. But it was not so before the Georgian era. There is a tenderness, a delicacy about the theology of the seventeenth century which is wholly wanting in that of the eighteenth, and has hardly yet been restored in that of the twentieth.

Fundamental questions discussed.

Again, great questions were discussed in the eighteenth century much more fully than they were in earlier periods. Underlying all such questions as, Did Christ leave one representative on earth? or, in other words, Should the whole Church be in subjection to one external authority? which was the root of the Papal Controversy; What is the true interpretation of Holy Scripture in such and such matters? which was the one question between the Anglicans and the Presbyterians—the questions in dispute in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—were the deeper questions, What were the true nature and character of our Blessed Saviour? which lay at the root of the Arian, Socinian, and Unitarian Controversies; and, What was the true character of the Holy Scriptures as a revelation from God? which was at the root of the great Deistic Controversy. These vital questions were not thoroughly threshed out until the period with which this volume deals, and for that reason alone it would be an important epoch.

Method of the work.

The subject is one which lends itself more readily to the essay-like than to the historical or chronological mode of treatment, and it will be observed that most writers upon it have adopted that method. Neither the volumes of W. E. H. Lecky, nor those of Sir Leslie Stephen, nor those of C. J. Abbey and his colleague (Canon Overton) can conscientiously be called narrative history; and Archdeacon Perry frankly owns that he is compelled to make an exception to his general rule in treating this portion of Church history, because "the history of the Church of England during the eighteenth century cannot well be written in the way of a chronicle preserving an exact order in the sequence of events. The external and political history of the Church has but little connexion with its internal and more real history, and to relate both of these together is liable to produce confusion."

The drawback to this method is that it is apt to produce

within the province of a writer on the Church of England. Any history of the kind which did not give full prominence to the names of John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, John Fletcher, and other leaders (and especially to the first named) would be absurdly defective. It may, however, be fairly contended that as an organised system Methodism never was a Church movement, and but for the commanding influence of its great founder, would never have retained so long as it did the continually loosening tie which, in a sort of way, bound it to the Church. From this point of view, the later Methodism of John Wesley belongs no more to a history of the Church of England than, say, the Hutchinsonianism of William Jones of Nayland. The two men—Wesley and Jones—are most interesting men, and the two subjects—Methodism and Hutchinsonianism—are interesting subjects, but neither of them is strictly matter for a Church of England history. Wesley himself may have intended his united societies to have been merely an expansion of the religious societies with which he had been familiar from his childhood, and which were handmaids of the Church, but did one in ten thousand among the rapidly increasing Methodists ever regard them in that light?

Methodism.

The reader will, therefore, find little in these pages about the marvellous organisation which Wesley either originated or adopted, not because it is a thing of naught, but simply because it is not a part of the particular subject of this book. For the same reason Whitefield's efforts, under the patronage of Lady Huntingdon, are lightly passed over, because they had even less connexion with the Church of England than the Wesleyan societies; Whitefield himself being far less of a churchman than either of the brothers Wesley. On the other hand, much more might be said, than is usually done in this connexion in describing these movements, concerning the prelates who were brought into contact with them—Gibson and Potter and, above all, that trio who were bound together almost all their lives long by the closest bonds, Butler, Secker, and Benson. To this period belongs also what is called the Anti-subscription movement, which was fraught with imminent danger to the Church; but, as it happily found quiet solution, it will not require to be dwelt upon at any great length. It

is during this period that the Church seems to have reached its nadir. Whatever the after effects of Methodism upon it, the immediate results were only to stir up a violent hostility, which was deplorable, but not altogether unnatural or unreasonable; and, apart from Methodism, the influences which affected the Church at this period were debasing.

III. The Third Period, from 1760 to 1790, includes the first half of the long reign of George III., which, whatever it may have been from a political standpoint, was conducive, so far as George was concerned, to the interests of religion and morality. There is no doubt a danger in attributing too much importance to the higher and purer tone which prevailed at Court, because the direct influence of such improvement would necessarily be limited to a small area, and at any rate in the middle of the eighteenth century to England. As Claudian so well says:

The Third Period.

> nec sic inflectere sensus
> Humanos edicta valent, quam vita regentis.

But the Court, then as now, set the fashion, and indirectly the influence of the good King and his good Queen permeated into quarters where the two were personally unknown. And then, again, the influence was not only good in itself, but also took the place of an influence which was intolerably bad. The Court of the first two Georges was little less immoral than that of Charles II., and infinitely more gross; and if there be any truth in the dictum of Edmund Burke, that vice divested of all its grossness loses half of its evil, the English nation gained nothing in this respect by exchanging the Stewarts for the early Hanoverians. Infinitely greater and more extensive than that of the Court was the influence of the Evangelical party within the Church, which was now beginning to be felt, and which steadily increased within this period. The story of Evangelicalism as distinguished from Methodism will form the leading feature of this part of our history, and the lives of such men as Venn, Newton, Scott, and the Milners, of Cecil, Berridge, Grimshaw, and the rest, must, unless through some fault in treatment, be both profitable and attractive. In this period also were prominent

The Hanoverian Court.

The Evangelical party.

within the province of a writer on the Church of England. Any history of the kind which did not give full prominence to the names of John and Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, John Fletcher, and other leaders (and especially to the first named) would be absurdly defective. It may, however, be fairly contended that as an organised system Methodism never was a Church movement, and but for the commanding influence of its great founder, would never have retained so long as it did the continually loosening tie which, in a sort of way, bound it to the Church. From this point of view, the later Methodism of John Wesley belongs no more to a history of the Church of England than, say, the Hutchinsonianism of William Jones of Nayland. The two men—Wesley and Jones—are most interesting men, and the two subjects—Methodism and Hutchinsonianism—are interesting subjects, but neither of them is strictly matter for a Church of England history. Wesley himself may have intended his united societies to have been merely an expansion of the religious societies with which he had been familiar from his childhood, and which were handmaids of the Church, but did one in ten thousand among the rapidly increasing Methodists ever regard them in that light?

Methodism.

The reader will, therefore, find little in these pages about the marvellous organisation which Wesley either originated or adopted, not because it is a thing of naught, but simply because it is not a part of the particular subject of this book. For the same reason Whitefield's efforts, under the patronage of Lady Huntingdon, are lightly passed over, because they had even less connexion with the Church of England than the Wesleyan societies; Whitefield himself being far less of a churchman than either of the brothers Wesley. On the other hand, much more might be said, than is usually done in this connexion in describing these movements, concerning the prelates who were brought into contact with them—Gibson and Potter and, above all, that trio who were bound together almost all their lives long by the closest bonds, Butler, Secker, and Benson. To this period belongs also what is called the Anti-subscription movement, which was fraught with imminent danger to the Church; but, as it happily found quiet solution, it will not require to be dwelt upon at any great length. It

is during this period that the Church seems to have reached its nadir. Whatever the after effects of Methodism upon it, the immediate results were only to stir up a violent hostility, which was deplorable, but not altogether unnatural or unreasonable; and, apart from Methodism, the influences which affected the Church at this period were debasing.

III. The Third Period, from 1760 to 1790, includes the first half of the long reign of George III., which, whatever it may have been from a political standpoint, was conducive, so far as George was concerned, to the interests of religion and morality. There is no doubt a danger in attributing too much importance to the higher and purer tone which prevailed at Court, because the direct influence of such improvement would necessarily be limited to a small area, and at any rate in the middle of the eighteenth century to England. As Claudian so well says:

The Third Period.

> nec sic inflectere sensus
> Humanos edicta valent, quam vita regentis.

But the Court, then as now, set the fashion, and indirectly the influence of the good King and his good Queen permeated into quarters where the two were personally unknown. And then, again, the influence was not only good in itself, but also took the place of an influence which was intolerably bad. The Court of the first two Georges was little less immoral than that of Charles II., and infinitely more gross; and if there be any truth in the dictum of Edmund Burke, that vice divested of all its grossness loses half of its evil, the English nation gained nothing in this respect by exchanging the Stewarts for the early Hanoverians. Infinitely greater and more extensive than that of the Court was the influence of the Evangelical party within the Church, which was now beginning to be felt, and which steadily increased within this period. The story of Evangelicalism as distinguished from Methodism will form the leading feature of this part of our history, and the lives of such men as Venn, Newton, Scott, and the Milners, of Cecil, Berridge, Grimshaw, and the rest, must, unless through some fault in treatment, be both profitable and attractive. In this period also were prominent

The Hanoverian Court.

The Evangelical party.

many good men who did not belong to the Evangelical party, but were rather what would now be called distinctly High Church. Such were Samuel Johnson and Edmund Burke among the laity, and George Horne, William Jones, Samuel Horsley, and Robert South among the clergy. The foundation of Sunday schools, the consecration of the first bishop for America, the removal of some of the disabilities of the Scottish Episcopal Church and its recognition by its sister Church of England, all belong to this period, which is, as will be seen, a singularly rich and fruitful one.

High Churchmen.

IV. The last Period embraces only ten or eleven years from 1790 to 1800, and the line of demarcation which distinguishes it from its predecessor is not so obvious as in the case of the other three, neither is it possible to select one particular turning-point with so much certainty as in the other periods. Nevertheless, there was a greater change, and that of the most decided character, in the last few years of the century, beginning, say, from about 1789, than in any other period. Three events which had lately taken place, all outside England, affected the English Church in a multitude of ways, and to an extent which it is extremely difficult to express or even to grasp. These events were—(i.) The War of American Independence and its results; (ii.) the altered position of the Scottish Episcopal Church; and (iii.) the French Revolution, the last, from our present point of view, being by far the most important of the three. The effects produced by these three events will be described in detail later on. It may suffice here to say that the first and the second tended to widen the horizon of the English Church by bringing it into contact with two sister Churches, the ancient Church of Scotland and the modern Church of America. The first two taught English churchmen, what many of them seem hardly to have grasped before, that there were other liturgies besides their own "incomparable" one, to use the epithet that was so often applied to our Prayer Book by men who paid scant attention to its plain rules; and that there were other kinds of bishops besides those who drove their coaches-and-six and sat in the House of Lords.

The Fourth Period.

Outside influences.

The third had far more varied and wide-reaching effects. It startled and excited the whole English people, but it affected different classes in different ways, and also the same people in different ways at different times. But one general effect resulted in all cases which differentiated the last decade of the century from those which preceded it. Whether it was right or wrong, a blessing or a curse; whether it was the harbinger of a glorious time coming, or the bird of ill omen that precedes the storm which will presently carry havoc and disaster in its mad career, the French Revolution at any rate disturbed the prevailing quiet, creating wild hopes on the one side and wild fears on the other, and by its subsequent development turning hopes into fears in a most bewildering manner. The extraordinary circulation of such books as Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, and of Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man*, in answer to Burke, are illustrations of the spirit on both sides. Paine's later book, *The Age of Reason*, and Hannah More's *Village Politics* by "Will Chip," show how the religious element became even more prominent than the political; while Sir James Mackintosh's *Vindiciae Gallicae*, so soon to be followed by his open recantation, illustrates markedly how hopes were changed into fears.

The French Revolution.

But one thing was common to all parties both in Church and State—a general awakening. The reign of lethargy was over. The reign of energy was begun. One definite change, so far as religion was concerned, may be noted, a marked alienation between the Church and Protestant dissenters, and a marked decrease of the hostility of the Church towards Rome. For, on the one side, the English dissenters (not including under that term the Methodists, who were strongly Anti-revolutionary) were supposed to be tainted by the revolutionary spirit; and, on the other side, the immigrant clergy from France were received in England with a respectful sympathy which went far to sink minor differences as to this and that mode of Christianity, so long as men were clearly seen to be on the side of Christianity at all. The Priestley riots in Birmingham, and the prevalence of the "Church and King" cry, are tokens of a very general feeling. But all this will appear in

New tendencies.

detail in the account of the last period, which, though the shortest in point of time, is perhaps the most distinctive and most momentous of all.

The concluding chapters will deal with some aspects of the time which must be treated differently from the rest. The work of the Church at home may be divided into periods, but the work of the Church abroad cannot without great inconvenience be taken otherwise than consecutively. Hence a chapter is devoted to the Missionary and Colonial work of the Church from 1714 to the end of the century. The titles of the other chapters explain themselves.

AUTHORITIES.—On the general history of the Church in the eighteenth century the student should consult Lord Mahon's *History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles*, 1713-1783, 7 vols.; W. E. H. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 7 vols. (cabinet edition); Abbey and Overton's *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (the two volume edition is the better); Abbey's *The English Church and its Bishops*, 1700-1800, 2 vols., a work of first-class importance and by no means so well known as it deserves to be; William Stebbing's *Verdicts of History Reviewed*; Archdeacon Perry's *Student's English Church History*, vol. iii.; the brief sketch at the close of volume ii. is noteworthy as being the first ever made of the period from an ecclesiastical point of view. The third volume of Perry requires to be read with caution. It is marred throughout by a one-sided view of men and movements, and in many instances its verdicts have already been reversed by closer and more impartial investigation.

FIRST PERIOD, 1714–1738

CHAPTER II

THE BANGORIAN CONTROVERSY AND THE SILENCING OF CONVOCATION

It may seem strange at first sight that an apparently slight change from one rather insignificant sovereign to another should produce so great and immediate an alteration in the condition of the Church as the change from Queen Anne to King George I. undoubtedly did. Neither Queen Anne nor King George can in any sense be called great monarchs, though poets might sing and preachers might speak of "great Anne," and men like Toland write of George I. that "never before did Britain possess a king endowed with so many glorious qualities," and a dissenter (and therefore, of course, a Whig and Anti-Jacobite) say of him that he was born a hero, "the choice both of God and the people, and the very darling of heaven." Neither of them had the hereditary right to the crown, and there was not much difference between their respective claims, for both were descended from one common ancestor of three generations back. It did not make much matter whether there was only one, as in the case of Anne, or many, as in the case of George, who had a prior claim, for the title of both was in reality a parliamentary title. The personality, moreover, of neither of them was of such a character as to impress itself deeply upon any community.

Queen Anne and King George I.

But when we penetrate a little below the surface, it is not

difficult to find reasons sufficiently strong to account for the change which so rapidly followed. For in the first place, the two sovereigns, though not of much account in themselves, represented, each of them, an idea. By some peculiar process which it is hard to explain logically, many people had undoubtedly persuaded themselves that Queen Anne had "the Divine right," was not only a parliamentary, but an hereditary sovereign. The Jacobite regarded her as a sort of regent for her brother, who was a mere boy at her accession, and the most ardent advocates for the Stewarts deprecated the pressing of his claim during his sister's lifetime. The revival on her accession of the superstition of the royal touch, the publication of her grandfather Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, the preaching of innumerable sermons on the Divine right, the utter failure of the attempt to punish Dr. Sacheverell for advocating that doctrine in its most extreme form, all tended to show that Queen Anne was regarded as the lawful sovereign, whom churchmen of the most marked type, who held what was called "the peculiar doctrine of the Church of England," as distinguished from "papists" on the one hand and "plebists" on the other hand, might consistently obey. But this could not, by the very utmost stretch of reasoning, be said of George I. He was a parliamentary king or he was nothing. So the Church, which had, most unwisely, committed itself up to the hilt to the hereditary as opposed to the parliamentary principle, found itself placed in a strangely false position. High churchmen must either eat their own words or must stand aloof from the new dynasty. A large number of laymen and the vast majority of the inferior clergy gave only a sullen acquiescence with a doubting conscience to the Government. This was in itself demoralising and tended to paralyse all active efforts.

Differences of "title" to the throne.

Then, again, Queen Anne, according to her lights, had certainly been a conscientious churchwoman from conviction, whereas the new king had not the least conception either of what the Church of England was, or the faintest interest in it, except as a powerful institution in his new country which had to be reckoned with. In a country like England the influence of the Throne must

George's churchmanship.

always be great, and it would hardly be too much to say that in the Queen's time that influence was generally exerted for, in the King's against the Church.

But far more powerful than the influence of the Crown was that of the minister who, during nearly the whole of the years embraced by this period, was paramount in every department, and especially in that department with which we here are now concerned. It would be difficult to imagine any policy which would be more disastrous to the true interests of the Church than that of Sir Robert Walpole. If he had shown no interest in the Church at all, and simply allowed it to take its own course in its own proper sphere, things would have been better. The Church was strong enough to stand by itself without being propped up by State aid and State patronage. If he had even shown his hostility to it by mulcting it of its revenues, so far as he could, and by showing all the favour in his power towards its rivals, the Church would not in the end have been seriously damaged. If he had swept away Test Acts, Corporation Acts, Uniformity Acts, in fact, all those artificial supports which were no supports at all, the Church, as a spiritual society, would have been the stronger for their loss. But he did none of these things. He looked upon the Church as a useful State engine, and he did his best, and with only too much success, to degrade it to that level. His policy simply and directly tended to stop the progress of good work. Happily for the Church, Walpole was for some time greatly under the influence of Bishop Gibson in Church matters, and that influence told in another and better direction. But the immediate results of his policy were sufficiently disastrous.

Sir Robert Walpole and the Church.

A full stop was put to the scheme of building fifty-two new churches within the Bills of Mortality, which hitherto had been going on prosperously. Only the following were actually built under the Act of Queen Anne:—St. Alphege, Greenwich; St. Anne, Limehouse; Christ Church, Spitalfields; St. George-in-the-East; St. Mary, Stratford-le-Bow (probably a restoration); St. James, Bermondsey; St. John, Horsley Down; St. John, Westminster; St. George, Bloomsbury; St. George, Queen's

Church building stopped.

Square; St. George, Hanover Square; St. Martin-in-the-Fields; St. Luke, Old Street; St. Mary-le-Strand. St. Mary Woolnoth, and the beautiful tower of St. Michael, Cornhill, were completed from the same fund. And even of those named, St. Martin-in-the-Fields, though built under the authority of the Commissioners appointed under the Act, was paid for by the parishioners, an Act being obtained in 1702 according to which four-fifths of the cost, which amounted in all to £36,891, was to be contributed by the landlords, and the remaining fifth by the tenants. But other and deeper things were due, more or less directly, to the sinister Church policy of Walpole. Men now saw the utter hopelessness of the attempt to procure the consecration of even one bishop for America, which before had seemed to be on the eve of accomplishment. Silence had fallen upon Convocation. There was a widening of the breach between the higher and the lower clergy through the persistent appointment of men to the highest offices who would obviously be unacceptable to the working clergy. Latitudinarianism, which was frequently divided from scepticism by a very thin line, was encouraged, and there was a general lowering of the whole tone of the Church and of its moral and spiritual standard. Let us enter a little more into detail.

Bishop Hoadly.

It was not a good omen for the future when almost the first bishop consecrated under the new dynasty was Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761). He was the man whom "the king delighted to honour." For in 1715 he was made Bishop of Bangor, in 1721 was translated to Hereford, in 1723 to Salisbury, and finally in 1734 to Winchester, then one of the richest prizes in the Church. So far as abilities went, Hoadly was fully equal to his position, in fact, he was one of the ablest in an age of able writers, but it was alleged against him that he employed those abilities not for but against that very Church in which he held high office; and that his writings were quite as objectionable after, as they were before his elevation to the Bench. So far from earning promotion by his active work, he hardly even set his foot in his first diocese; and it is a curious illustration of the lax views which prevailed on such matters, that in the books, pamphlets, and sermons which

were written against him, and their name was legion, this obvious objection was never even raised.

The name of Bishop Hoadly introduces us to the famous Bangorian Controversy, which arose as follows. In 1716 was published a collection of posthumous papers written by Dr. Hickes, who died in December 1715. The "publisher," or, as we should now call him, the editor, was no doubt Dr. Brett, a very distinguished Non-Juror. The volume was entitled *The Constitution of the Christian Church and the Nature and Consequences of Schism, set forth in a Collection of Papers written by the late R. [Right] Reverend George Hickes, D.D.* This, we may note in passing, is probably the only instance in which a Non-Juring bishop of the New Consecration[1] is described by his title of Right Reverend. He was titular Bishop of Thetford. Hickes's statements startled some who had been on friendly terms with him during his lifetime. He unchurched in the strongest and most uncompromising language all who did not join the "Faithful remnant" of which before his death he had been the recognised head. "Detestable usurpers, breakers of the bond of peace, unity, subordination, and all charity in the City of God . . . very Corahs," etc., illustrate the style of the writer. The book created both surprise and indignation, and Hoadly, who had just been raised to the see of Bangor, saw his opportunity, with his usual keenness, and made the most of it. Within a few months he had published his *Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors both in Church and State*—a marvellously able work, considering the short time he must have taken to write it. In this he took occasion to recommend his own ecclesiastical position, which was purely Erastian. To strike at the root of the theory of a visible Church altogether, it proposed sincerity as the only test of truth, and thus caused dismay among many who would have been as much opposed to the Non-Jurors as he was himself. He tried to place all, who like himself had accepted the new dynasty, in this dilemma: "You must either adopt my view of the situation, or else you must, if you are consistent,

Bangorian Controversy.

Hickes's attack.

Hoadly's reply.

[1] For the New Consecration, see the previous volume of this history by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, p. 240.

become Non-Jurors; there is no middle ground between the two." He did not say this in so many words, but it appears to be the gist of his argument. It is difficult to answer except from the Non-Juror's point of view; and as a matter of fact, by far the most effective answer he received was from the pen of a Non-Juror.

Hoadly's book was followed by a sermon preached before the King on March 31, 1717, in the Chapel Royal, St. James's. The subject was *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ.* He impugned the idea of the existence of any visible Church at all, ridiculed the value of any tests of orthodoxy, and poured contempt upon the claims of the Church to govern itself by means of the State. He laid stress upon the character of the Church in our Lord's lifetime under His immediate government, and denied that the Lord had delegated His authority to any man or body of men. The Church was identical with the Kingdom of Heaven, and was not, therefore, "of this world." "He left behind no visible, human authority; no vicegerents, no interpreters upon whom absolutely His subjects are to depend; no judges over the consciences or religion of His people. If not, then what still retains the name of the Church of Christ would not be the Kingdom of Christ, but the Kingdom of those men, vested with such authority." The sermon thus ignored altogether (and this is characteristic of most eighteenth-century theology, which was rather Christological than Pneumatological) the work of the Holy Spirit in guiding the Church under changed and enlarged conditions. This is the strongest thing which can be urged against it. Hoadly was pleading for simplicity as against over-elaboration of authority, and was the pioneer of those who in our own day raise the cry, Back to Christ, oblivious, in both cases, of what has been the actual method of historic development, namely, the Christ as interpreted, to say the least, by St. Paul and St. John. Hoadly lived in pre-critical days, and must not therefore be judged too harshly by us. Of his sincerity and purity of motive there can be no question. And further, his opponents attacked rather what they read into his sermon than what was actually there. The sermon itself was restrained and almost innocuous

Hoadly's sermon.

if taken as the starting-point, and not as the goal, of Church development.

A host of writers were at once in arms against the book and the sermon. The Lower House of Convocation appointed a committee to examine and report upon them. The committee, which consisted of Mosse, Sherlock, Cannon, Friend, Bisse, Danson, Spratt, and Barrell, began their work on May 3 and reported to the House on the 10th. Their report, known as the *Representation to be laid before the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury*, was voted, *nemine contradicente*, to be received and entered upon the books of the House. It stated that the two works of Hoadly tended to subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and to reduce His Kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion; that they also impugned and impeached the regal supremacy in cases ecclesiastical, and the authority of the legislature to enforce obedience in matters of religion by civil sanctions. The report went on to request the archbishop and the bishops to deal with the question, but before this could be done in any way, the Government interfered and prorogued Convocation until November 22. A rumour was spread that it was at the request of Hoadly himself that the Government had taken this decisive step, but Hoadly at once disclaimed any such action, and said that he had no other thought, desire, or resolution but to answer in his place before the same House to which this accusation was designed to be brought, and before those worthy prelates to whom the appeal was to be made. So far, therefore, as Convocation was concerned, the matter was at an end. But the controversy grew in volume and intensity outside that assembly. Among the ablest of the writers who attacked Hoadly were Thomas Sherlock, then Dean of Chichester and afterwards Bishop of London, Dr. Andrew Snape, Provost of Eton, and Dr. Francis Hare, then Dean of Worcester, afterwards Bishop of Chichester. Hoadly wrote *A Reply to the Representation of Convocation*, and also replied to the ablest and most prominent of the many who wrote against him, ignoring the lesser men.

Report of Convocation.

Replies to Hoadly.

But among the lesser writers was a young man whose work

is the only one that has escaped oblivion, and has, in fact, become one of the abiding treasures of English theology. The Bangorian Controversy elicited the *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* of William Law (1686-1761), the first work which brought that great writer into note. It is one of the many proofs of the extreme acuteness of Hoadly that he left this brilliant work entirely unnoticed. He had sense enough to see its merits, but he had also sense enough to see that it would be a mistake for his own interest to call attention to an unknown writer who would else probably not attract much notice. The result proved that he was right. There are many lists of writers on the Bangorian Controversy in which Law's name is not even mentioned, as, for example, that given in the *Life of Bishop Sherlock*, where the omission is all the more strange since Law was a favourite of Sherlock. But when Law became famous, then his *Three Letters* became famous also, and have continued so ever since. The favour which Hoadly enjoyed at Court is shown by the fact that four of his opponents—Sherlock, Hare, Snape, and Mosse—who were Royal chaplains, were deprived of their chaplaincies in consequence of their opposition to him. Robert Mosse (or Moss) was Dean of Ely, and one of the committee of the Lower House of Convocation which drew up the report on Hoadly's teaching.

William Law's reply.

Royal chaplains deprived.

The virtual silencing of Convocation was the direct result of the Bangorian Controversy, though that controversy went on for some time after Convocation was silenced. We can well understand that the minority would object to any synodical condemnation of Bishop Hoadly's book and sermon. Both were distinctly written in defence of the Government, and the sermon especially, having been preached by the royal command and in the Chapel Royal, and having, to say the least, met with no disapprobation, might be regarded as almost officially stamped with the royal approval. Although the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation had been very far from unanimous on most points, it was by no means certain that the Upper House would not have agreed with the Lower in its *Representation* of the dangerous tendency of the works in question. And if so,

Silencing of Convocation.

the result would have been that the whole body of the clergy, as represented in their proper assembly, would have been at variance practically with the Court as represented by the King and his ministers. But even if the Upper House had not endorsed the views of the Lower, the result would have been hardly less embarrassing, for it was the Lower House, not the Upper, which represented the general body of the clergy; and the Government which, in spite of the suppression of the Rebellion of 1715, was far from being settled, could ill afford to have that powerful body arrayed against it. Therefore, before the matter could be discussed in the Upper House, Convocation was quietly prorogued on May 17, 1717, by a somewhat arbitrary exercise of the Royal Supremacy, and did not meet again for the despatch of business for one hundred and thirty-five years.

The method by which Convocation was silenced was a very simple one, viz. by the withholding of the customary royal letter or licence authorising the two Houses to proceed to business. Convocation assembled as usual at the beginning of every Parliament, but having no authority to transact any definite business, its meetings were purely formal and nothing was done. In the first instance, the prorogation was only for six months, and for the causes noted above it does not appear that so far the action of the Government was unwarrantable; but it does appear most unreasonable that the suspension of the active powers of Convocation should have continued after the occasion which called it forth had passed away. A slight attempt was made later in the century to revive its powers, but it came to nothing. Convocation was unpopular in the State, and was looked at askance even by many in high office in the Church.

This unjust and tyrannical proceeding was all the more provoking because, just before its suspension, Convocation seemed to be settling down to its proper work in dealing with the real exigencies of the Church. Nothing could be more practical, more sensible and seasonable than the list of subjects submitted to it for discussion; and on these Canons might have been drawn up. These subjects included excommunications and commutations (*i.e.* pecuniary commutations) of penances, terriers of

The business before the Convocation of 1717.

Church property, the prevention of clandestine marriages, marriage licences, a form for the consecration of churches and chapels, the better investigation of testimonials from candidates for holy orders, regulations for the residence of clergy on their benefices, plans for making the 47th and 48th Canons, which deal with curates and lecturers, more effectual, preparation for Confirmation and the more orderly performance of that rite, the encouragement of charity schools, the establishment of parochial libraries, a protest against duelling, the want of sufficient church accommodation, the work of Christian missions both to the heathen and to our own plantations, the licentiousness of the stage, the re-establishing and rendering useful the office of rural deans. This list includes the very subjects in regard to which there were such grievous deficiencies and abuses in the Georgian era, and on which it was of incalculable importance that "the Church of England by representation" should utter its voice. As it was, such matters were settled, so far as they were settled at all, by individual bishops, without apparently any concerted action whatever. There seemed, moreover, to be a better chance then of the Convocation doing its work than there had been for some years, since the Revolution of 1688.

Constitution of Convocation.

Again, the head of the Convocation of Canterbury is the Archbishop, primate of all England, as the head of that of York is the Archbishop of York, primate of England. All the members of both Houses alike (which do not the least correspond with House of Lords and House of Commons, for they were originally only one House and were separated simply for convenience' sake) are merely the archbishop's assessors in Convocation. It depends, in a degree greater than any other assembly, upon its president; or, to put it in more Church-like language, the provincial synod wholly depends upon the archbishop of the Province. And, so far as Canterbury was concerned, there was a primate at the time of its suspension who was far more likely to take an intelligent and sympathetic interest in its debates than either of his two immediate predecessors. There is no doubt that both Archbishop Tillotson and Archbishop Tenison disliked and distrusted Convocation, and knew and cared little for its constitution. But Archbishop Wake, who succeeded

to the primacy in 1715, had long taken the deepest interest in it, had written much about it, and is regarded by many as the very highest authority on the subject. The controversy between Wake and Atterbury has been described in a previous volume. Many indeed sympathise with the higher views of Convocation's functions, independence, and powers which Atterbury took, and think that Wake's views were too much tinged with Erastianism, but about his vast knowledge of the subject there can be but one opinion. He was also a thoroughly practical and very earnest man. Surely under such a head Convocation might have done good work.

But more must be said about Archbishop Wake, who was Archbishop of Canterbury during nearly the whole time covered by this period, and who was perhaps the most interesting and distinguished of all the primates who will come before us at all. Archbishop Tenison died in December 1715, only a little more than a year after he had placed the crown upon the head of George I. The primacy having been declined by Dr. Hough, Bishop of Lichfield, was offered to and accepted by Wake, then Bishop of Lincoln. He was thoroughly equal to the post, as a rapid sketch of his antecedents will show.

Archbishop Wake, 1715-1737.

William Wake (1657-1737) was born at Blandford in Dorset, and was the son of a gallant soldier who had fought on the Royalist side in the Civil War, and had suffered much for the King's cause, as also had several others of his family. In 1672 he was elected a Student of Christ Church, Oxford, then at the zenith of its fame under Dr. Fell. It is said that after he had taken his degree, his father thought of making him a clothier, which seems a strange career for him both on social and intellectual grounds. The former objection, however, would not count in the seventeenth century; for though the Wakes were an ancient family of gentle blood, there was not then the same line of demarcation between the gentry and the trades which afterwards arose, and which is now very wisely again being obliterated. There was no strong social reason why the brilliant young Christ Church Student should not be a tradesman, but there was an intellectual one. The calling of a clothier is scarcely one in which the abilities and attainments of a promising scholar would find

full scope for their exercise; and it was better for himself, as well as for the Church to which he rendered great service, that he should belong to "the cloth" in another sense of the term.

He received deacon's orders on September 25, 1681, priest's on March 12, 1682, both from the Bishop of Oxford, on the title of his studentship, and in 1682 went to Paris as chaplain to Viscount Preston, who had like himself been at Christ Church, and who was now envoy extraordinary at the French Court. This French visit was an eventful step in Wake's life, for it brought him into contact with the Gallican Church at a specially critical period in its history, when a synod of the French clergy put forth the *Declaratio Cleri Gallicani*. He fleshed his maiden sword in controversy with the most brilliant and distinguished officer of that Church, the great Bossuet, the "eagle of Meaux"; and in the opinion of many, wonderful to relate, the young Englishman did not come off second-best in the contest. In 1685 he returned to England, and in 1688 was appointed Preacher at Gray's Inn, and, in 1689, a Canon of Christ Church. A young man who had dared to measure swords with the greatest of the Roman Catholics was not likely to find favour with James II., but immediately after the Revolution, Wake, who had earned his promotion, was made a Royal chaplain to King William III., and Deputy-Clerk of the Closet. Henceforth his rise was rapid. He was lecturer of St. Ann's, Soho, which he vacated in 1692. In 1693 he was made Rector of St. James's, Westminster (Piccadilly), in February 1703 Canon Residentiary of Exeter, and two days later Dean of that Cathedral, in 1705 Bishop of Lincoln, and, finally, in January 1716 Archbishop of Canterbury.

Early relations with the Gallican Church.

Meanwhile he had won for himself a very distinguished name both as a writer and a preacher. His works on the subject of Convocation have already been noticed. In the last of these, published in 1703, and entitled *The State of the Church of England in those Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other public Assemblies, historically deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons to the Present Time*, he is thought by many to have said the final word on the subject,

and to have produced a work which never has and never can be superseded. He was indefatigable in his endeavours to defend the position of the Church of England on the ground of history, and was most anxious for the publication of the original authorities of English history. But he rendered even more valuable service by his pen in another direction. Patristic studies were not at all generally cultivated in the English Church after the Revolution, and Wake was an exception in devoting great attention to patristic literature, which in 1693 bore fruit in the publication of *An English Version of the Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, with a Preliminary Discourse concerning the Use of those Fathers*. In this discourse he uttered a most forcible and much-needed plea for their study, on the ground that the writers "were contemporary with the Apostles and instructed by them; that they were men of eminent character in the Church, and therefore could not be ignorant of what was taught in it; that their writings were approved by the Church of those days, which could not be mistaken in its approbation of them," with much more to the same effect. It is to be feared that his pleading was but slightly attended to during the time with which this volume is concerned.

Wake as an author.

During the ten years when he was Bishop of Lincoln he took the deepest interest in his diocese, as is shown by the fact that, shortly after his appointment, he drew up a document which appears to be almost unique. It is entitled *Speculum Dioceseos*, consists of "occasional observations" on the various parishes in his huge diocese, and is evidently the result of his own personal inspection of them. It is a perfect mine of information, specifying the chief family or families resident in each parish, the monuments in the different churches, the schools, charitable institutions, and such like.

Bishop of Lincoln.

Soon after his appointment to Canterbury an interesting episode occurred which at a more favourable time might have led to important consequences, and which even then was not, as we shall see, without practical results. It has already been noticed that, thirty years earlier, when he was quite a young man, he had been brought into contact with the Gallican Church. Since

Gallican Church.

then that Church had come into collision with Rome by the publication in 1713 of the Papal Bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the Jansenist doctrines and all Gallicanism. The Bull bore with especial hardness on the doctors of the Sorbonne, and the much-beloved Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles. The head of the theological faculty of the Sorbonne at that time was the famous Church historian Du Pin. The English chaplain in Paris, one Beauvoir, happened to be dining in his company and that of some other French divines, when they all agreed that they ought to appeal from the Pope to a General Council, and Du Pin expressed his desire for a union with the Church of England as the most effectual measure to unite all the Western Churches; and then, turning to the chaplain, begged him to give his duty to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The message was, of course, delivered, and Wake was just the man to take the matter up. He begged Beauvoir to make his compliments to Dr. du Pin, and to add that the archbishop had profited by his labours for many years and would be glad to serve him in any way he could. This was the beginning of an interesting correspondence conducted in excellent Latin on both sides.

A French plan of union.

Another doctor of the Sorbonne, M. Piers de Girardin, apparently without knowing anything of what had taken place between Wake and Du Pin, hinted in an oration before the Sorbonne faculty that the dispute between the Gallican and Roman Churches might induce the English to return into the bosom of the Catholic Church on the same footing as the Gallican Church had taken up. Whereupon Du Pin showed Wake's letters both to Girardin and the Archbishop of Paris, and Girardin wrote to Wake. The Archbishop of Paris and the Sorbonne formulated a plan with a view to union which was forwarded to Wake. But Girardin had from the first taken a very different line from that which Du Pin had taken. "To return into the bosom of the Catholic Church" was not what a man like Wake, who thoroughly believed in the Anglican as a true branch of the Catholic Church, intended, and he made it perfectly plain to his correspondents that no union that was not based on the fact that two national churches were negotiating on perfectly equal terms could be thought

of for an instant. Unfortunately Dr. du Pin, who would certainly have been the most hopeful medium of communication, died in Paris, June 6, 1719, and although the negotiations still went on, they became less and less likely to be brought to a successful issue.

But one good practical result did ensue from the movement. It led one of the greatest of the French churchmen, Dr. Courayer, a Benedictine and Canon and Librarian of the Abbey of St. Geneviève at Paris, to look closely into the question of the validity of English Orders, and to publish a work entitled *A Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordination of the English, and of the Succession of the Bishops of the Anglican Church.* Courayer contends for their validity in the strongest possible terms, and utterly condemns the Roman custom of reordaining English priests. This most important admission from a highly distinguished Roman Catholic, who remained a Roman Catholic to the end, the English Church owes in the first instance to Archbishop Wake. Indeed, the archbishop's attitude throughout the whole affair seems to have been just what it should have been, at once conciliatory and firm, showing the utmost sympathy with the Gallican Church in its troubles, but at the same time intimating unmistakably that the Anglican Church was quite clear about its own position, and could never, for the sake of unity, think for a moment of returning to the Roman obedience, even in that modified form which the French themselves were prepared to do, and expected the English to do as a term of union. Rome was in fact the rock upon which the negotiations split. Wake clearly implied that there could be no real union unless France separated from Rome; his correspondents, that there could be none unless England, in some sense, rejoined Rome; and so long as there was that divergence between them obviously nothing could be done. The whole affair was conducted with the utmost courtesy on both sides, and such *rapprochements* are not perhaps without their value.

Validity of Anglican Orders.

The same spirit which Wake showed in this correspondence he showed also in other matters. He was, in the good sense of the term, much more liberal-minded than the majority of

the churchmen of his day. For it is a curious fact that never was the English Church more stiff, narrow, and insular than at the time when it took the most grovelling views of its mission as a spiritual society, when it had virtually accepted its position as a mere State department, and when its rulers were, with some slight exceptions, Latitudinarians. One of these exceptions was Archbishop Wake. He, more than any other man, would have been qualified and adapted to take part in that function which towards the close of the century De Maistre declared to be the special function of the English Church,—a most remarkable admission. "If ever—and everything invites to it—there should be a movement towards reunion among the Christian bodies, it seems likely that the Church of England should be the one to give it impulse. Presbyterianism, as its French nature rendered probable, went to extremes. Between us and those who practise a worship which we think wanting in form and substance there is too wide an interval: we cannot understand one another. But the English Church, which touches us with the one hand, touches with the other those with whom we have no point of contact."

The Via Media.

Now the operation indicated in the last sentence was that which Wake tried to perform. We have seen how he tried to hold one friendly hand to the church of which De Maistre was a member, "going," it was said, most untruly, "to the very verge of Popery," in order to do so. It is not surprising that, judged by the extremely narrow standard of the Georgian era, he was suspected of tending towards Popery. For his patristic studies had taught him that some things which were thought to be popish were really primitive, notably the lawfulness of prayer for the faithful departed, in which few but Non-Jurors, who, whatever else the majority of them were (for some became schismatics), were churchmen, followed him. He held out the other friendly hand to foreign Protestants, taking very much the same line as that great churchman, Bishop Cosin, took in the previous century, and refusing to unchurch them for a lack about which they could not help themselves. Of one phase of this side of his work more will be said in the last chapter. With one curious exception, he advocated the kindly treatment of nonconformist ministers, though without

compromising any Church principle. Churchmanship of the Sacheverell type he never admired, and he never joined in the enthusiasm about the Doctor, but on the contrary preached strongly against him. He opposed the cruel Schism Act of 1714 in its progress through the House of Lords, and was altogether not much in sympathy with that chiefly political Church movement which took place during the last four years of the reign of Queen Anne. Wake's Liberalism.

Strange to say, when Wake became primate he seemed to change his front, advocating the Bill against occasional conformity which he had formerly condemned, and the retention of the Schism Act against which as Bishop of Lincoln he had vehemently protested. "He argued that there was no need to repeal a Bill of which no advantage had ever been taken." What was the cause of this sudden change of front? Evidently not time-serving; for, it will be observed, when the High Church (as the term was understood in Queen Anne's time) had things all their own way, then Wake was against them. When they went into the shade, then Wake was on their side. But the reason of this apparent inconsistency is really very simple. He remained the same man, but the circumstances among which he lived were entirely changed. He was a religious-minded man, and shrank from identifying himself with such questionable Church defenders as Lord Bolingbroke, who merely made the Church a stalking-horse for his own advancement. But in the early Hanoverian period the pressing dangers affected the most vital points of the Faith, such as the Divinity of our Lord, and we can well understand that a man like Wake would deem that to be inexpedient in the earlier period which was both expedient and necessary in the later, when he thought he saw signs of treachery within the very citadel itself. "Some of our bishops," he said, "are labouring to pull down the Church in which they minister, and to introduce such licentiousness as would overthrow the grace of the Holy Spirit, the Divinity of Christ, and all fundamental articles of our religion." It was not a groundless alarm. The different forms of Arianism, which all led by an irresistible logic to the denial of our Lord's Deity (for there was no middle ground tenable), were making great way both inside and outside the Church. Arianism.

Whether the Bill against Arianism, which Wake in conjunction with the Earl of Nottingham endeavoured to bring into Parliament, was the best way of stemming the evil may be questioned, but about the genuineness of Wake's alarm and the solid ground for it there can be no doubt.

The last years of Wake's life were passed in retirement. His health broke down, and the work of the primacy was virtually performed by one who, curiously enough, had been Wake's successor as Bishop of Lincoln, and at this time was Bishop of London, Dr. Gibson. In his seclusion the archbishop (so he tells us) felt especial satisfaction in the privilege he enjoyed of being able to attend divine service in his private chapel four times every day, an interesting fact to observe in view of what is sometimes said about the neglect of church life in the eighteenth century. Perhaps Wake is all the more prominent because in his ten years as Bishop of Lincoln there was not, as there certainly had been in the time of Queen Anne, any sort of comparison, in point of national influence, between the Southern and Northern provinces. John Sharp, Archbishop of York, died only a few months before Queen Anne, who had taken him for her spiritual director, and had made him the most influential of all living churchmen. It was in accordance with Sharp's expressed wish shortly before his death that Sir William Dawes, Bishop of Chester, was appointed his successor; but though the new archbishop was a most estimable man, he never exercised the influence which his predecessor had done. It must be confessed that during the whole of the twenty years of Wake's primacy his name is not much connected with that practical work which now necessarily engrosses so much of the time of our prelates. The fact is, there was very little of such work going on. The sleepy time had set in so far as practical activity went. But, on the other hand, churchmen were remarkably wide-awake in the matter of religious controversy, and this leads us to the bright spot in a dark age, the very powerful defence of Christian truth which characterised it.

AUTHORITIES.—For Bishop Hoadly the best authority is himself, see *Works*, 3 vols. folio, 1773. The famous sermon must be read if his position is to be understood. Many of his earlier sermons preached at St. Peter-

le-Poer are also well worth study. See in addition his *Answer* to the *Report of Convocation*, 1718; Lathbury, *History of Convocation*. A careful study of Hoadly's position by the Rev. J. Neville Figgis appeared in the *Guardian* of October 11, 1905. No satisfactory biography of Archbishop Wake exists, though there are ample materials at Christ Church, Oxford. The dates, for example, of his ordination as deacon and priest will be found for the first time in the text. The article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and one by Canon Overton in the *Lincoln Diocesan Magazine* for 1891, are the best accounts we have of him so far. Consult also his works cited in the text

CHAPTER III

THE TRINITARIAN AND DEISTIC CONTROVERSIES

THE closing years of the seventeenth century had seen the planting of a seed which was to become a fruitful tree in the eighteenth. In 1695 John Locke published his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, which marked a new departure in the history of the study of the Christian faith. He determined to investigate the "question about justification," and after that to inquire, What is the faith which justifies? without reference to any antecedent discussions or decisions thereon. He studied simply the New Testament, as an inspired book to be read in the light of the reason, the "Human Understanding" upon which he had already so brilliantly written. His mind was to be as free from prepossessions as the famous blank sheet of white paper possessed by his imaginary postulated new-born child. The result of Locke's investigation was the discovery, which is perfectly true, that our Lord and His Apostles, when they admitted converts into the Church, did not require of them subscription to the Athanasian Creed, the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Westminster Confession, but were content with the simple acknowledgment that Jesus was the Messiah. This, with the necessary addition of belief in God, was therefore the one and only essential article of faith. "Nobody can add to these fundamental articles of faith, nor make any other necessary but what God hath made and declared to be so." Belief in Jesus as the Messiah carried with it indeed belief in all the doctrines which Christ preached. No one could be a Christian who held that Christ taught a given doctrine and who forthwith declared that

John Locke.

Conditions of admission to the Church.

doctrine to be false. But beyond the express teaching of the Christ it was not essential to go. A believer must add to his faith the duty of repentance and the willingness to obey the laws of the Kingdom of Heaven. Then he might be "solemnly incorporated into the Kingdom." The New Testament, therefore, became the only necessary manual for the Christian. Creeds and Canons of Councils and all similar apparatus were superfluous, and, indeed, might be positively harmful. The only court of appeal was the New Testament, and human reason was the supreme arbiter as to its meaning. In a word, the limits of authority were narrowed as they had never been before, and it was upon this attenuated basis that the subsequent Trinitarian and Deistic controversies were founded so far as the opponents of the Catholic Faith were concerned.

When George I. became King the Trinitarian Controversy had been going on for many years, and many able pens, notably those of George Bull and Charles Leslie, had been employed in the defence of the traditional positions. But it was not until he had been on the throne nearly five years, that their ablest champion, or, at any rate, the one who wrote most fully and exhaustively in their defence, appeared on the scene, and his chief antagonist was the ablest champion on the other side. The controversy now resolved itself virtually into a duel between Samuel Clarke (1675-1729) and Daniel Waterland, and it was a duel between giants. There was not much difference between the combatants in point of abilities and attainments, and if Waterland was victor all along the line, as most unprejudiced judges will own that he was, the reason lay not so much in his intellectual superiority as in the fact that Clarke's position was in itself hopelessly untenable. There is logically no middle ground between the Trinitarian position and Unitarianism pure and simple; and when Dr. Clarke and others tried to find one, they were standing on a descending slope down which Waterland pushed them with remorseless logic. The consequence was that, when there was a recrudescence of the controversy towards the close of the century, Anti-Trinitarians took, as we shall see, the only ground on which they could stand, that is, Unitarianism.

Samuel Clarke.

Dr. Samuel Clarke, who was chaplain in-ordinary to William III., Queen Anne, George I. and George II., had become Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, in 1709, and in 1712 published his *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*. In this, he made an exhaustive collection of all the texts in the New Testament, to the number of 1251, bearing upon the nature of the Godhead. The mere headings of the chapters were in themselves suspicious. Chapter i. dealt with "God the Father," but chapter ii. dealt with "the Son of God," and chapter iii. with "the Holy Spirit of God," instead of with "God the Son" and "God the Holy Spirit." The author was more guarded in his expressions than his predecessor Whiston, but he maintained that the Father alone is Supreme God, that the Son is a Divine Being only in so far as divinity is communicable by this Supreme God, and that the Holy Spirit is inferior both to the Father and the Son, not in order only, but in dominion and authority. The book was fiercely attacked by many writers, but mention need only be made of four. Dr. Wells complained of Clarke's method, that he had made no use of the Old Testament, that he had failed to show how the true sense of Scripture was to be ascertained, and that, following Locke in this respect, he had spoken lightly of creeds, confessions of faith, and patristic testimony. Robert Nelson complained of his unfair treatment of Bishop Bull, and Dr. Gastrell pointed out that there was only one out of his fifty-five propositions to which an Arian would refuse to subscribe. But all these are now forgotten. One great work remains to be described.

Clarke's position.

Replies to Clarke.

Daniel Waterland (1683-1740) was admirably suited both by training and by temperament for the part he took. He was the son of a country clergyman, the Rector of Walesby and Flixborough in Lincolnshire, and was educated at the Free School, Lincoln, from which he passed to Magdalene College, Cambridge, in March 1699. At Cambridge he remained for the greater part of his life, being elected Scholar of Magdalene in 1702, Fellow in February 1704, and Master just nine years later. He was thus thrown into the thick of university society in Cambridge in its palmiest days, and his contact with such men as Bentley,

Archdeacon Waterland.

Thomas Sherlock, and Hoadly must have tended wonderfully to quicken his intellect and to prevent him from writing anything rashly and without weighing his words well. He was a man of profound learning and of great acuteness of intellect, and was thus singularly adapted for the task he undertook. He could both think clearly and express himself in lucid language. He knew exactly what he meant to say, and he said it in the plainest possible way without sacrificing clearness to grace of diction. His very deficiencies are in his favour. He was not endowed with much of the poetical temperament, and so was not tempted, like Platonists and Neo-Platonists, to indulge in lofty metaphysical speculations into which his readers might have found it difficult to follow him. He is never obscure. We may agree with him or differ from him, but there is never any question as to what he means. So, too, his coldness of nature saved him from indulging in vague declamation or in that personal abusiveness which was only too common a feature in the theological controversies of the day. He argues, but he does not declaim. He hits his opponents fairly and hard, but does not descend to scurrilous personalities. The very completeness of his defence of the doctrine of the Trinity against its Arian assailants so prevented them or their successors from ever occupying the same ground that his books became more or less unnecessary. They closed the controversy in its then phase, and only the historical student now needs to refer to them.

All his works on the Trinitarian Controversy fall within our present period, the first appearing in 1719, the last in 1724. It may be added that Waterland, like Wake, showed a knowledge and appreciation of the early Fathers which was rare in their day, and which stood him in good stead in his writings on the Holy Trinity. There are few sentences in the language, perhaps, which express more finely the use of the Fathers than these of Waterland: "We think that Christ never sits more secure or easy on His throne than when He has His most faithful guards about Him, and that none are so likely to strike at His authority or aim at dethroning Him as they that would displace His old servants only to make way for new ones. . . . In a strict and proper sense I do not know that the Fathers

Waterland on the Fathers.

have any [authority] over us; they are all dead men; therefore we urge not their authority, but their testimony, their suffrage, their judgment, as carrying great force of reason. Taking them in here as lights or helps is doing what is reasonable and using our own understandings in the best way . . . I follow the Fathers as far as reason requires and no further; therefore this is following our own reason."

What has been said of the Trinitarian Controversy is equally true of the Deistic. That too had been going on for many years before George I. became King, but with the exception of Charles Leslie's (1650-1722) *Short and Easy Method with the Deists* and Richard Bentley's (1662-1742) *Remarks on A Late Discourse of Freethinking: in a Letter to F. H., D.D.* (*to N. N.* in the later editions), *by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, both of which were brief, albeit able, productions, no work of any great note had been written against the Deists before the Hanoverian period. The First and Second Parts of Bentley's *Remarks* were published in 1713. The eighth edition, which was published in 1743, contained the Third Part. Two half-sheets of the Third Part were added to the seventh edition in 1737. Bentley died in 1742. But the first twenty-four years of the Georgian era produced many works of extraordinary merit. The Deistic, though far shorter-lived and less influential in the long run than the Anti-Trinitarian movement, was far more talked about at the time, and created more alarm in the Church. Deism, indeed, is a vague term, and used to be ascribed indiscriminately to a most heterogeneous class of thinkers. It was, however, a better term than Freethinkers, which the Deists claimed for themselves. For the Church to admit that claim was to give away its own case, for freethinking is the right of every man. This was perceived at last, and in 1715 a journal was published under the title of *The Freethinker*, conducted by orthodox clergymen, in order to indicate the true use of that title. But taken in its proper sense, as applied to those who thought that there is no need of a revealed religion, because the religion of nature is sufficient, Deism produced, with one somewhat doubtful exception, no really great writers, whereas it called forth antagonism of the very highest rank. Hence, partly

Deism.

from its own inherent weakness, but partly also from the far higher calibre of those who wrote against it than that of those who wrote for it, it was quickly snuffed out, and by the time our present period closed had almost become a thing of the past.

Historically regarded, Deism is an important link in the chain of thought from the Reformation to our own day. It started from the desire, the honest desire in most cases, to discover a reasoned and reasonable Christianity, and to establish, if possible, a firm and lasting basis for conduct. The Reformation had abolished the authority of the Latin Church. Most Protestants, like Chillingworth, had tried to prove that the only basis for belief and for conduct was the Bible. Hobbes had, as a stage in advance, insisted that the Bible itself must be subject to the criticism of history and of reason. The Deists went still further and, as they thought, deeper, and affirmed that behind the Bible and what they regarded as similar writings there was human nature, and that the basis of authority was to be sought and found in the common beliefs of men. This is seen in its simplest form in the attempt of Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1581-1648), the brother of George Herbert, to state what these common beliefs were which were regarded as being fundamental in human nature. The dominant thought was Nature. It was the English form of the doctrine inculcated later by Rousseau—Return to Nature. Nature is sufficient. It will not be possible to do more here than give a brief notice of the chief Deistic writings. At the root of them all there lies the denial of the supernatural, the mysterious, as it lies at the root of the destructive criticism within and without the Church of our own day. If there be nothing beyond what we call material, if there be no mystery which the human mind cannot penetrate and solve, the Deistic method is justified, though its particular affirmations would require modification through the growth of knowledge.

Origin of Deism.

Junius Janus Toland, commonly known as John Toland (1669-1722), stands as the first important representative of the school. In his *Christianity not Mysterious*, published in 1696, he insisted upon the necessity of absolute demonstration as a basis for belief. "I banish all hypotheses

Toland.

from my philosophy. So long as a thing is only probable our judgments must remain in suspense." The sentence is noteworthy as forming the starting-point of the argument of the *Analogy*. He stated further that mystery tends to vanish before the presence of growing knowledge; but in his application of this principle to concrete instances he broke down, and practically had no followers.

Wollaston.

William Wollaston (1659-1724) received his education at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; he became a schoolmaster and took holy orders. He was enriched by the will of a wealthy cousin, retired from active work, and led the life of a recluse in Charterhouse Square, London, and there puzzled over problems he made no attempt to solve in practice. His system had the merit, or the demerit, of extreme simplicity. All sin he reduced to one form, that of lying. He also defended the doctrine of a future life with the argument drawn from the inequalities of this: some place, he argued, is demanded "where the proper amends could be made." His reasoning throughout is independent of any authority or evidence derived from Revelation.

Tindal.

Matthew Tindal (1657-1733), a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, was by far the most important of the Deist writers. His chief work, *Christianity as Old as the Creation*, was never wholly completed, and only the First Part was published in 1730. The Second Part was destroyed in manuscript by Bishop Gibson, to whom it had been left. The thesis of the First Part is again very simple, and is based on the unchangeable character of God and of His laws. What He said, He said once and for ever. What, therefore, in Christianity was new was not true, and what was true was not new. Tindal added to this the unchangeable character of human nature, and there fell into error. Being independent of Revelation, he had not studied St. Paul as deeply as he had Moses, or the Apostle would have taught him in the argument in the Epistle to the Romans that Revelation is progressive, and adapted to the condition of those to whom it is given. But Tindal, quoting a phrase of Sherlock's, insisted that Christianity was not a new thing but a republication of the law of Nature, being in fact as old as the creation. The

student will again note the source of one of Butler's chief subjects in the *Analogy*. These were the chief writers. Others, though intellectually and morally very inferior to Toland, Wollaston, and Tindal, made much stir by their attacks. But after Tindal, Deism began to decline.

Thomas Chubb (1679-1747), for instance, was an uneducated man of the working class, and continually falls into serious blunders in his writings. His chief work, *The True Gospel of Jesus Christ*, published in 1738, contains, like the earlier work of Herbert, what he regarded as fundamental and universal in religion. He found only three truths. First, that conformity to the eternal rules which result from the natural and essential differences of things, and nothing else, makes men acceptable to God. Secondly, that repentance and a change of life, and those alone, will secure God's mercy. Thirdly, that God will ultimately judge the world, and give to every man according to his works. He denied the eternity of punishment, the literal inspiration of the Bible, and at least doubted the truth of the Resurrection.

Chubb.

One only among these thinkers seems, as Sir Leslie Stephen points out, to have discerned the dawning of a truer and better method. Thomas Morgan, who in his youth is said to have been a farmer's boy in Somerset, became a Presbyterian minister, and afterwards studied medicine, is best known as the author of *Physico-Theology*, published in 1721. He saw dimly that things require to be accounted for as well as affirmed or denied, and although his work had not any wide influence, yet he deserves to be remembered as one of the pioneers of modern historical science as applied to biblical criticism.

Morgan, d. 1743.

Two others should be mentioned as taking a different line, and attacking specific Christian positions rather than seeking for a foundation upon which to build the edifice of Natural Religion. The first is Anthony Collins (1676-1729). He had had a predecessor in the previous century in Charles Blount (1654-1693), whose *Oracle of Reason* (now an exceedingly rare book), written just before the suicide of the author, would be forgotten if it had not been rendered famous by Bishop Wilson, who made an extract from it in his

Blount.

commonplace book, now known as the *Maxims of Piety and Christianity*. Collins, in his *Discourse on Free-thinking*, first used for controversial purposes the nascent New Testament criticism of Drs. Mill and Bentley, who had stated that there were 30,000 various readings in the Greek Testament. Collins argued that a text thus shown to be utterly uncertain must require considerable knowledge to understand it, and that hence it was valueless to the ordinary reader. He is also important (along with Woolston) as giving to Butler one of the subjects of the specially evidential chapters which close the *Analogy*. Whiston had tried to vindicate the prophecies of the Old Testament by rejecting such of them as could not be made to square with the events they foretold. Collins accepted Whiston's process of elimination, but used it, in his *Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, published in 1724, and later, in his *Literal Scheme of Prophecy considered*, to discredit prophecy altogether. The list closes with the sad name of Thomas Woolston (1669-1733), Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, who published, 1727-29, his *Six Discourses on the Miracles*, striving to show that they had no historical basis, but that their value was wholly spiritual. He had published earlier some minor works based on the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, a method he had acquired from his prolonged study of Origen. But it was in the *Six Discourses* that his main attack was made. It was a poor performance, full of grotesqueness and ribaldry, and more like the work of an insane man than of a serious thinker. He dedicated each discourse to a bishop. Gibson, Chandler, Smalbroke, Hare, Sherlock, Potter were singled out for this distinction. The sale of the numbers was very large, and they soon ran into a sixth edition, and called forth a series of angry and stern replies. Discussion was one thing, but Woolston's want of even ordinary courtesy and decency was another, and his book was resented more than any other of the Deistic writings. Whiston refused to support him any longer, while Gibson issued a pastoral letter and Smalbroke preached a sermon against him. Ultimately Woolston was prosecuted for blasphemy on March 4, 1729, before Lord Chief Justice Raymond. He tried to defend himself by pleading

Collins.

Woolston.

that the phrase "hireling clergy" was where the shoe pinched his opponents, and his counsel urged that he had written as a sincere Christian; to which the Attorney-General retorted that if the author of a Treasury libel should write at the conclusion "God save the King," it would not excuse him. He was found guilty on four counts, and sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of £100. The fine he was unable to pay, and he lingered in prison till his death in 1733. Dr. Clarke and Whiston tried to gain his release, but failed.

Deism was never organised into a system. It was hardly a school of thought, though a good deal of it was based upon the teaching and spirit of John Locke. The writings it produced are now mostly forgotten or known only by name, and their oblivion is deserved, for they do not repay study, save as marking a stage in the development of the theological life of the Church. They aroused thought and inquiry, and caused the men of that time to examine more closely than ever before the nature and foundations of belief in Christianity and in the Bible. To them we owe the permanent treasure of the writings of Bishop Butler and William Law. These live, while those that called them forth become buried more and more deeply in the dust-heaps of the past.

AUTHORITIES.—On the Trinitarian Controversy the works of Dr. Clarke and Waterland will be sufficient. Waterland has been admirably edited by one who was about his own intellectual equal, William van Mildert, who has contributed a most luminous and interesting review of his life and writings. The subject is well treated in Abbey and Overton's *History of the Church of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. Deism is dealt with at length in Sir Leslie Stephen's *English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols. Lechler's *Geschichte des Englischen Deismus*, 2 vols., 1841, is indispensable. The writings of the Deists themselves are fairly accessible (with the exception of Charles Blount), but they hardly repay examination. Any one reading Tindal will have a sufficient knowledge of the main drift of the school at its best. Leland's *View of the Deistical Writers*, 2 vols., 1830, gives an accurate and useful summary of the chief books produced. Canon A. S. Farrar's *Bampton Lectures*, "A Critical History of Free Thought," 1862, are valuable, *inter alia*, for their vivid sketch of the rise and decline of English Deism. For the Arian Controversy see Curteis, *Bampton Lectures* for 1871; Charles Leslie's *Theological Works*; Whiston's *Essays*, 1713; and *Memorials of William Whiston*, by himself. Waterland's *Works* (especially vols. i., ii., and iii.) should also be consulted. John Hunt's *History of Religious Thought in England*, vol. iii., is valuable for reference to movements and persons throughout the whole century.

CHAPTER IV

THE ANSWER TO DEISM

THE barest sketch of all that was written against the Deists between 1714 and 1738 would fill a goodly sized volume, for all who had any pretensions to be called divines, and many who had not, thought it necessary to lift up their testimony in book, pamphlet, or sermon, and to print the same, against the fashionable heresy. All, therefore, that can be done here is to select from the multitude (itself a rather invidious task) a few of those which have a permanent value, and further to confine ourselves to those written by churchmen, while frankly and gratefully owning that the Protestant dissenters, notably Samuel Chandler and John Leland, made valuable contributions to the defence of our common Christianity. To avoid confusion, it should be noted that there were two Anti-Deistic writers of the name of Chandler, the one Edward, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (afterwards of Durham), and the other Samuel Chandler, an eminent dissenter. Both wrote against Collins; the latter also against Morgan, and against the anonymous author of *The Resurrection of Jesus considered*. It may be well also to group the replies so far as possible according to the books against which they were written; although, since some of them — the *Analogy*, for example—are directed against more than one assailant, this will involve some cross-division. As Tindal was the most prominent of the Deists, the most important of the replies were directed against his book.

The least known, but certainly not the least able, of the Anti-Deistic writings, was *The Defence of Revealed Religion against the Exceptions of "Christianity as Old as the Creation,"*

published in 1732 by John Conybeare (1692-1755), then Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, and afterwards Dean of Christ Church and Bishop of Bristol. As up to the time of his writing Conybeare had spent the greater part of his life at Oxford, where he had been praelector of philosophy, tutor of his college, and a favourite University preacher, before he became rector, he had somewhat of the same sort of discipline and training to fit him for such work as Waterland, though in his days Oxford was not so brilliant an intellectual centre as Cambridge. Still, Conybeare's work bears evident traces of that particular culture, self-restraint, and dignity which a man acquires when he is in daily contact with equal and higher intellects. The work against which he wrote was the masterpiece of Deism, and its author, Matthew Tindal, is the only one of the Deists properly so-called who show traces of the same sort of training as Conybeare; most of the Deistic writers being conspicuous for a kind of banality and commonplaceness and a want of dignified reason. Tindal had been a pupil of George Hickes, the Non-Juror and one of the most cultured men of his day, at Lincoln College, Oxford, and was afterwards a Fellow of All Souls. So we should expect him to write like a scholar and a gentleman, which he does. The Christian advocates were well advised when they directed their best works against Tindal, who was their most formidable antagonist. But Conybeare was more than his equal. Avoiding all scurrility and personality, he discusses in calm and dignified, but at the same time luminous and expressive language, the question which Tindal's work had raised, and also does full justice to the element of truth which Tindal's work contained, for in one sense Christianity is as old as the creation. Conybeare's work does not deserve the oblivion into which it has fallen. It was highly appreciated by his contemporaries. Warburton, among others, who was not given to overpraise, pronounced it one of the best reasoned books in the world. And in our own day the great German historian of English Deism, Lechler, seems hardly to know how to find language strong enough to express his admiration of its excellence.

John Conybeare.

William Law also entered the lists against the Deists, and some think that his *Case of Reason, or Natural Religion, fairly*

and fully stated in Answer to "Christianity as Old as the Creation," published in 1731, is his ablest work. The *Case of Reason*, however, while it illustrates Law's strength, also illustrates his weakness. With characteristic courage he selects, as he generally did, the most powerful antagonists, and with characteristic acumen he at once found the weak point in his antagonist's armour and thrust his spear into it. The *Case of Reason*, in fact, anticipates the same argument which Butler used, mainly against the same writer, Tindal, with such tremendous effect five years later. But, on the other hand, the subject naturally tended to bring into prominent relief William Law's usual foible. The wildest and most ignorant of tub-preachers, who, for the most obvious of reasons, that of the tailless fox in the fable, loves to dwell on the worthlessness of human reason and the futility of human learning, could not depreciate them more than this most powerful reasoner (in spite of Dr. Johnson's dictum that William Law was no reasoner) and most cultured scholar, and his depreciation of these in his answer to Tindal detracts greatly from the value of the work, and has probably been the reason why it has never been popular. Law's *Case of Reason* went to show that reason had no case at all.

William Law's *Case of Reason.*

There is such an extraordinary difference between the general tone of all the rest of the literature, Deistic and Anti-Deistic alike, and *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, that it is difficult to grasp the fact that the latter was part of the great controversy. But it was. If you put this one not very bulky volume into one scale and the enormous mass of writings on both sides into the other, it would nearly outweigh them all. In other words, the student may learn more of real and permanent value by reading and re-reading his Butler (especially if he will add to the *Analogy* Butler's other works, his *Sermons, Charges, and Letters*) than by wading through the reams and reams of paper which have been filled up by almost all the rest put together. The life of Butler will be told in a later page, in which he will appear as one of the bishops of the period.

Butler's *Analogy.*

It has already been observed that the atmosphere of Cambridge or Oxford was conducive to the successful com-

position of the work of Waterland and Conybeare. But Butler breathed an atmosphere better for him than either in the composition of his great work, that of the secluded country parsonages in the far north where he lay "not dead, but buried" for fifteen years before the publication of the *Analogy*. He held the rectory of Haughton-le-Skerne, near Darlington, from 1721 to 1725, and Stanhope rectory from 1725 to 1740. Stanhope he held *in commendam* along with his bishopric until he was appointed Dean of St. Paul's in 1740, when he resigned the rectory and also his Rochester prebendal stall. In those days of slow and dangerous travelling these country parsonages were far more secluded than they are now, and it was in them that he thought out his whole subject in all its bearings. Indeed, he had begun to think it out long before. When he was only twenty-one he had entered into an anonymous correspondence with the famous Dr. Clarke, then at the height of his reputation, just after the publication of his masterpiece on the *Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*. Thus at the very outset Butler showed how deeply the subject had engaged his thoughts, as the following sentence from one of his letters to Clarke will indicate. "I have made it, sir, my business, ever since I thought myself capable of such sort of reasoning, to prove to myself the being and attributes of God. And being sensible that it is a matter of the last consequence, I endeavoured after a demonstrative proof; not only more fully to satisfy my own mind, but also in order to defend the great truths of natural religion, and those of the Christian revelation which follow from them, against all opposers; but must own with concern, that hitherto I have been unsuccessful; and though I have got very probable arguments, yet I can go but a very little way with demonstration in the proof of these things." Here is the germ of Butler's dictum that Probability is the guide of life, and it is worth noting that he afterwards also adopted the *a priori* argument for the being of God which was developed in this correspondence with Clarke, and with which Butler at the first had the difficulties to which he refers above.

Germ of the *Analogy*.

The *Analogy* was not an answer to any particular Deist in the sense in which Bentley's *Remarks on a Discourse of Free-*

thinking was an answer to Collins, or Sherlock's *Tryal of the Witnesses* to Woolston, or Law's *Case of Reason* to Tindal. He never refers directly to the Deists at all, and it is frequently difficult to trace the source of the objections with which he is dealing. But his book was far more damaging to their cause than most of the rest put together, and what some regard as its defects, many others think to be among its greatest merits. As the most important theological work of the century, and in one sense the most influential at the time, turning as it did the whole course of thought in a different direction, it may not be out of place to dwell a little upon it.

Butler's postulate of Theism.

Butler, then, takes it as proved that there is an intelligent Author of Nature and natural Governor of the world. As against the Deists he was perfectly justified in doing so, for they not only admitted this truth, but made it the very centre of their system. "For as there is no presumption against this prior to the proof of it: so it has been often proved with accumulated evidence. . . . Nor does it appear, so far as I can find, to be denied by the generality of those who profess themselves dissatisfied with the evidence of religion." Taking this as his postulate, he gives the following outline of his designs, the whole of his treatise, Parts I. and II., being a proof, and surely, taken as a whole, an impregnable proof of the various points here specified. It is worth quoting in full.

Summary of the *Analogy*.

"Now the Divine government of the world, implied in the notion of religion in general and of Christianity, contains in it; that mankind is appointed to live in a future state; that there every one shall be rewarded or punished; rewarded or punished respectively for all that behaviour here, which we comprehend under the words, virtuous or vicious, morally good or evil: that our present life is a probation, a state of trial, and of discipline, for that future one; notwithstanding the objections, which men may fancy they have, from notions of Necessity, against there being any such moral plan as this at all; and whatever objections may appear to lie against the wisdom and goodness of it, as it stands so imperfectly made known to us at present: that this world being in a state of apostasy and wickedness, and consequently of ruin, and the sense both of their con-

dition and duty being greatly corrupted amongst men, this gave occasion for an additional dispensation of Providence; of the utmost importance; proved by miracles; but containing in it many things appearing to us strange, and not to have been expected; a dispensation of Providence, which is a scheme or system of things; carried on by the mediation of a Divine person, the Messiah, in order to the recovery of the world; yet not revealed to all men, nor proved with the strongest possible evidence to all those to whom it is revealed; but only to such a part of mankind, and with such particular evidence, as the wisdom of God thought fit.

"The design then of the following treatise will be to show, that the several parts principally objected against in this moral and Christian dispensation, including its scheme, its publication, and the proof which God has afforded us of its truth; that the particular parts principally objected against in this whole dispensation, are analogous to what is experienced in the constitution and course of Nature, or Providence; that the chief objections themselves which are alleged against the former, are no other than what may be alleged with like justness against the latter, where they are found in fact to be inconclusive; and that this argument from analogy is in general unanswerable, and undoubtedly of weight on the side of religion, notwithstanding the objections which may seem to lie against it, and the real ground which there may be for difference of opinion, as to the particular degree of weight which is to be laid upon it. This is a general account of what may be looked for in the following treatise. And I shall begin it with that which is the foundation of all our hopes and of all our fears; all our hopes and fears, which are of any consideration; I mean a Future Life."

The method by which Butler proves his thesis is the inductive method of Bacon, not the *a priori* method of his friend Dr. Clarke, though he did not, however, reject the *a priori* method altogether. He argues from facts which are known to other facts which are like them. He is most cautious both in his general aim and in his details. He does not profess to give a demonstration, but simply a probable proof; "to Us" (the capital is his own) "probability is the very guide of life," that is, it is so as a

Method of the *Analogy*.

matter of fact in the ordinary affairs of the present life, and therefore it ought to be so in regard to a future life. Nothing is more remarkable than Butler's intellectual honesty or his philosophical modesty. Every possible objection is allowed its full force, is fairly stated, and then answered. This it must have been which led the younger Pitt to say to Wilberforce, that Butler raised more doubts than he solved. He proceeds very cautiously step by step, constantly reminding the reader what a little way he has gone, and how impossible it is to go very much further without approaching the confines where human knowledge ceases; in short, he is perpetually giving, in the quietest manner possible, a snub to the optimistic spirit of the age, which thought nothing to be beyond the range of man's powers in this best of all possible worlds.

Butler himself, on the other hand, was something of a pessimist. He took a rather melancholy view of human nature both on its moral and intellectual sides. "The world is in a state of apostasy, wickedness, and ruin." "We are an inferior part of the creation of God." "We have not faculties for this kind of speculation." "We know not at all what death is, but only some of its effects." "We make very free of Divine goodness in our speculations." "Our ignorance is forgotten when we argue against religion." "It is credible beforehand that we should be incompetent judges of a Revelation." Such expressions, which might be multiplied almost indefinitely, show the bent of his mind, while in vivid contrast to the littleness of man is always found his intense impression of the greatness of God. "In nothing is Butler more conspicuously superior to his contemporaries than in his sense of the immeasurable greatness of God and of the littleness of man." This judgment would apply not only to the contrast between such Deists as Butler had probably in his mind and himself, but also to any comparison of him and those good men of the Evangelical revival who were soon to arise, and who, in many of their speculations, notably on the Calvinistic Controversy, seem to have thought that everything was knowable. The *Analogy*, therefore, is a humbling, and a wholesomely humbling, book. There is nothing in it to charm the imagination, no parade of learning, no attempt at rhetoric.

Butler's pessimism.

nor even to make the sentences run easily and fluently. Its very punctuation is irritating, and some day an editor may arise who will boldly, if sacrilegiously, recast it. The style is certainly rather cramped and crabbed, and although there is in fact no obscurity of thought, yet so much matter is packed into so small a compass that it is difficult reading. It cannot be read to any purpose without a continuous effort. But the effort will be amply repaid. Style of the *Analogy*.

If Butler's manner was not calculated to make his book popular, his method was still less so. Readers generally prefer clear, sharp, definite statements, without any hesitation and without any qualification. But these Butler does not give them. He is more inclined to understate than to overstate, and he seldom states anything without adding what can fairly be said on the other side. This came to be a matter of conscience with him. "He is penetrated," as it has been beautifully expressed, "by the sense that his pen moves under the very eye of God, and by the knowledge that the sacred interests of truth must eventually be compromised by overstatement." Having so few elements of popularity, it is very creditable to the age in which the *Analogy* appeared that a second edition should have been called for before the year was out, and a third within two years. But it is not surprising. The defects of the age were moral and spiritual rather than intellectual. In one respect Butler is quite in sympathy with the *saeculum rationalisticum* in which he lived. He is eminently rational. He does not, like his contemporary, William Law, deny reason its proper place. On the contrary, he distinctly owns that "reason is the only faculty we have to judge concerning anything, even Revelation itself." And fearing, no doubt, that his frequent insistence upon man's ignorance should be construed into a depreciation of reason, he more than once carefully warns us against drawing that conclusion. Its impartiality.

Again, his greatest enemies could not accuse him of "enthusiasm," that bugbear of the eighteenth century, the dislike of which Butler shared with his fellow-countrymen. He is the very incarnation of common-sense, and this is alike a source of his strength and Dislike of enthusiasm.

of his weakness. It prevented him from ever losing himself in wild and extravagant speculation. Readers will remember the quaint phrase which he uses after he has been enlarging upon the possibilities of the removal of hindrances to virtue in a future life, "But let us return to the earth our habitation."

On the other hand, this tendency prevented him from ever rising into loftier regions than those of the barest prose. He lays full stress upon prudential notions which would appeal most of all to the mind of the eighteenth century, and although his great work was no doubt suggested by the Deists (or Freethinkers, as he would have preferred to call them), yet he never alludes to them even by those general designations, much less by their individual names. "Those persons who" is his nearest approach to a designation. The *Analogy* can thus be fully read and appreciated by those who have never read a word of the Deists' writings. There is not the least necessity to go through a course of Toland and Collins, or even of Tindal, before beginning it. This was not only the more charitable but the more attractive line to take. A reader is apt to rebel against attacks upon individuals, and to doubt whether their views are fairly represented. These reasons may in some measure account for the favourable reception which the great work met with. What is more curious still is that no book, nor even pamphlet, worth mentioning was written against the *Analogy* during the writer's lifetime, nor for many years afterwards. For solid structure and logical precision it stands almost unrivalled in the English language. Its weakest part is the second, which deals, contrary to his own stated plan, with the more positive evidences for Christianity, with the argument from miracles and prophecy, as against Collins and Woolston. Even its central chapter, that on the doctrine of Mediation, needs modification and expansion in the light of fuller knowledge and later difficulties. Butler was not a minute student of exegesis. He tried to see things on a wide scale and to see them wholly. Therein lies his permanent value to us, as it lay to his contemporaries. He did not answer his opponents piecemeal, sentence by sentence, but examined the foundations of the contested theological positions and was content with that.

Impersonality of the *Analogy*.

Deism, which began with Locke and culminated with Tindal, soon began to decay as an attempt to supersede historical Christianity by a system of abstract truth with an underlying metaphysical basis. The Christian advocates had won the victory on that field. They had shown that the Christian faith was the only satisfactory ground for any practical obedience to the law of nature. In other words, they had demonstrated the unity of the origin and of the sanction of natural and revealed religion. There was nothing in natural religion which was not found, and found in a much better and fuller form, in the Christian faith, and this chiefly because it rested not upon human speculation, but upon the personal revelation in Christ of a personal God. The attack, therefore, shifted its ground and was directed against specific points in the faith itself, and particularly against the arguments from miracles and from prophecy. Deism became critical rather than constructive. And with the change in the form of the attack, there necessarily followed a change in the form and method of the reply.

Decay of Deism.

There is no need to expand further what has been said in our last chapter upon Bentley's reply to Collins. Brief note should be made of the principal writings called forth by the attacks on the argument from prophecy, the chief of which are to be found in Whiston's *Essay toward Restoring the True Test* (1722) and Collins's *Grounds and Reasons of Christian Religion* (1724). It was Edward Chandler (1671-1750), Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, who here did good service to the cause of truth by his *Defence of Christianity from Prophecies* (1725), an extremely able and learned work. Two circumstances have militated against its permanent reputation. It was written in answer to Collins, who had but lately received a severe flagellation from Bentley, and whose powers were, therefore, perhaps too much depreciated. Collins was a much stronger man than Woolston, though much weaker than Tindal. And further, the enormous advance made in Biblical exegesis and scholarship since Chandler's day would make any work of that date on the detailed explanation of Scripture texts, especially from the prophets, obsolete now. This, of course, applies to

Edward Chandler

the Deistic criticisms also. They are now quite out of date. But Chandler in his time was a strong man. His strength lay partly in his wide and accurate scholarship and in the thorough use he made of it, and partly also in the wisdom he displayed by conceding points for which some had unwisely contended, with the inevitable result of weakening their own cause. Hence a certain amount of dissatisfaction was expressed by contemporaries with some of Chandler's positions, which, however, have been justified by later and wider investigations.

Thomas Sherlock.

The Anti-Deistic works of Thomas Sherlock (1678-1761), afterwards Bishop of Bangor and then of London, chiefly penned when he was simply Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, and Master of the Temple, were ably written and ought to have lived, but, for reasons apart from their intrinsic merit, they have not. In 1725 he published six sermons which had been delivered at the Temple Church in the spring of 1724, on *The Use and Interest of Prophecy*. These were deservedly popular in their day and quickly ran through many editions, but the same reason which made Chandler's has also rendered Sherlock's work now almost obsolete.

The *Tryal of the Witnesses*.

In 1729, when he had become Bishop of Bangor, he published a still more famous and original work on the Deistic Controversy, entitled *The Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. It was written against Woolston, who led the attack upon miracles. Woolston wrote against our Lord's miracles as a whole, but chiefly against the great and crucial miracle of the Resurrection. Sherlock's book, however, was far more than an answer to Woolston, and is rightly described by his biographer as "a very ingenious treatise, in which, with singular felicity, he turns his great store of legal knowledge to the purpose of an advocate pleading the cause in hand, and of a judge who has to decide upon its evidence." The work was very popular. It was well written and excited great attention, which caused it to run through fourteen editions in a very short time. The plan is quaint and ingenious, though not perhaps so original as has been thought; for it may have been suggested by Richard Bernard's *The Isle of Man, or*

Legal Proceedings in Manshire, to which Bunyan owed something. Sherlock's book was better suited to the rather gross mind of the eighteenth century than to the more refined, and perhaps it may be added the more reverent, piety of a later day. This is how the *Tryal* ends :—

Gentlemen of the jury, I have laid before you the substance of what has been said on both sides. You are now to consider of it, and to give your verdict.

The jury consulted together, and the foreman rose up.

Foreman. My lord, we are ready to give our verdict.

Judge. Are you all agreed?

Jury. Yes.

Judge. Who shall speak for you?

Jury. Our foreman.

Judge. What say you? Are the Apostles guilty of giving false evidence in the case of the resurrection of Jesus, or not guilty?

Foreman. Not guilty.

Judge. Very well; and now, gentlemen, I resign my commission, and am your humble servant.

The company rose up and were beginning to pay their compliments to the judge and the counsel, but were interrupted by a gentleman who went up to the judge and offered him a fee.

What is this? says the judge. A fee, sir, said the gentleman. A fee to a judge is a bribe, said the judge. True, sir, said the gentleman; but you have resigned your commission, and will not be the first judge who has come from the bench to the bar without any diminution of honour. Now Lazarus's case is to come on next, and this fee is to retain you on his side. There followed a confused noise of all speaking together to persuade the judge to take the fee; but as the trial had lasted longer than I expected, and I had lapsed the time of an appointment for business, I was forced to slip away; and whether the judge was prevailed on to undertake the cause of Lazarus or no, I cannot say.

Zachary Pearce (1690-1774), Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and afterwards Bishop of Rochester, also wrote against Woolston a work entitled *The Miracles of Jesus defended*, published in 1729. This, too, deserves to be a classic but is

not. It is a perfect model of controversial divinity. Both Pearce and Sherlock, in writing against Woolston, had a much easier task than those who contended with Tindal. Poor Woolston was a man of far inferior calibre. He was, in fact, not quite sane, and his book answers itself. Pearce was, then, less regarded than his fellow-disputants because his services were less needed.

Zachary Pearce.

There is an especial charm about the next Anti-Deistic writing from the interesting personality of the author, the beauty of his style, and the romantic circumstances in which it was composed. *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher* was written by Dean George Berkeley (1685-1753). It was thought out, and probably written, during his voluntary exile when he had been engaged in his noble but abortive missionary project in the Far West, which will be more fully described in a later chapter. It was while he was anxiously waiting in Rhode Island for the fulfilment of the promise of the Government to grant him aid in his missionary enterprise, which was never fulfilled, that the *Alciphron* was prepared, either in the library of his little house at Whitehall in Rhode Island "or in a natural alcove under the Hanging Rocks near the shore." Internal evidence is in favour of the out-of-door composition. The book abounds in fresh and beautiful descriptions of natural scenery. It was published soon after his return to London in 1732. It is the longest, and was for some time the most popular, of Berkeley's works. It consists of a philosophical argument in favour of Christianity at a time when, as Butler also pointed out, Christianity was regarded not only as unworthy of investigation, but as so fundamentally unsound and untrue, so wanting even in the necessary basis of historic fact, that the only thing to be done with it was to finally discredit it by means of mirth and ridicule, and thus prevent it from any longer interfering with the ways and works of the world. It was dead and needed only to be buried.

George Berkeley.

The Minute Philosopher.

Berkeley adopted the dialogue as his mode of stating the case *pro* and *con*. The minute philosophers are the English Freethinkers, and his purpose is to restore men's faith in the Divine origin of the order of things, of which Nature and her laws are the outward manifestation. He quotes

largely from ancient and modern writers, and assumes a familiarity with them on the part of his readers that could not be taken for granted in our own day. There are seven dialogues. The first simply opens the subject. The second and third are concerned with ethics. The fourth pleads for the recognition of an eternal providence and supremacy implying a mind which is eternally creating and guiding and inspiring the natural order of things, and further demanding the recognition of a Divine law in nature itself. The fifth, sixth, and seventh dialogues deal with the advantage to civilisation of religion, and with some objections to Christianity on the ground of its mysteriousness. In passing, he criticises Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* and the *Characteristics* of Lord Shaftesbury. He upholds religion as sufficient for the demands of reason, for the basis of morality, and for the hope of immortality after the outward body has perished. The personages of the dialogues are Alciphron and Lysicles, who represent Deism, or the minute philosophy, the former intellectual like Tindal, the latter as only adopting Deist views in order to be able to live more freely. Euphranor and Crito are the advocates of morality and religion. Dion is chiefly a looker-on.

Analysis of the book.

The interlocutors.

The speakers in the first dialogue seek after some common ground, some first principles capable of being applied to questionable points in ethics and theology, and the conclusion is reached, and is put into the mouth of Alciphron, that all beliefs that are indispensable to the common weal are natural, and therefore true rules for human action. Alciphron had to find room somewhere in his scheme of thought for beliefs which are not held in early life, or not held by all men, but which nevertheless are latent in the very constitution of man. But man cannot be considered as standing alone. He belongs to a social organism, and true beliefs may therefore be necessary not for any particular individual, but for the whole of humanity present and to come. A given person, or even a particular age, may not seem to require some special article of faith, but it may just as certainly be needed for other persons and other conditions of society.

Argument of the first dailogue.

The problem presented, therefore, in the following dialogues is this: Have the beliefs in the supremacy of the Divine order and in the future life of men as moral agents a tendency to promote the highest good of men? Are they required for the highest development and satisfaction of human nature? For these were the beliefs which the Freethinkers wished men to abandon.

The ultimate problem.

In the second dialogue, after discussing Mandeville's famous but misleading dictum, "private vices, public benefits," and declining to base belief in God on the mere fact that it is beneficial to society and consoling in time of trouble, Alciphron goes to the root of the matter. These considerations do not prove the truth of the doctrine of the existence of God, though they may urge its desirability as part of our intellectual and moral equipment. The real question is, Are we compelled by our reason to believe that God exists? Do we even know the meaning of such an affirmation? And here Berkeley introduces his own theory of vision. We have the same kind of proof of the existence of God that we have of an external world. We observe phenomena, and we deduce the reality behind and beyond them. This deduction, moreover, is not merely negative. We can see in visible phenomena the action of an intelligent spirit similar to that of which we are conscious in ourselves. Religious faith, therefore, corresponds to bodily vision. To see the truth is to know it. And if knowing it we practise it, then we have attained the perfection of man, the ideal truth, the ideal life. To know without putting the knowledge into practical form as action, is not to know in the deepest sense of the term. Religious knowledge predicates religious life as its necessary and absolute consequent. To know God is eternal life.

The real question.

It is needful to add, by way of criticism, that Berkeley's enthusiastic temperament was not perhaps the most suited to write upon such a theme. The *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*, working upon his intense conviction of the necessary truth and vital importance of revealed religion, carried him away, and led him sometimes to be too violent, if not absolutely unjust, in his attacks upon his

Defects of the *Alciphron*.

opponents. This mars the beauty and also the effectiveness of the *Alciphron*, and still more of the eleven papers in the *Guardian* which Berkeley wrote against the Deists. But, notwithstanding these defects, if we take everything into account—the grace and clearness of his style, the high reputation he deservedly won in other fields of literature, the service he rendered to philosophy as the apostle of idealism, the sweet attractiveness of his personal character—the name of Berkeley will probably be admitted to be the greatest name among all the writers against Deism, with the sole exception of that of Butler.

There is yet another work to be mentioned which the author and many of his friends would be astonished to find placed on a very much lower level than the *Analogy*. In point of bulk, display of learning, and impressiveness generally, it bore the relation of a giant to a pigmy. This is the once famous *Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated*, by William Warburton (1698-1779). That this work was intended to be a contribution to the Deistic Controversy we have the author's own authority for affirming. In his curious Dedication of the first three books to the Freethinkers or Deists, he begins: "Gentlemen, as the following discourse was written for your use, you have the best right to this address." One of the objections raised against the Mosaic system as a Divine revelation was that it made no mention of a future state. No doubt such an objection might be found in the Deists' writings, but it is not a prominent one, nor one frequently insisted upon by them. It was, however, quite in the vein of Warburton, who was fond of paradox, to take it up, admit it as a fact, and then turn the tables upon his opponents by showing "that their objection was the strongest of all proofs that the Mosaic system was a Divine Revelation." He puts his case in the form of two syllogisms thus:—"i. Whatsoever Religion and Society have no future state for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence. The Jewish Religion and Society have no future state for their support. Therefore the Jewish Religion and Society was supported by an extraordinary Providence. ii. It was universally believed by the ancients, on their common

Warburton's *Divine Legation.*

The syllogisms.

principles of legislation and wisdom, that whatsoever Religion and Society have no future state for their support, must be supported by an extraordinary Providence. Moses, skilled in all that legislation and wisdom, instituted the Jewish Religion and Society, without a future state for its support. Therefore, Moses who taught, believed likewise, that *this* Religion and Society was supported by an extraordinary Providence."

Warburton makes this a peg upon which to hang all sorts of information of the most heterogeneous kind. Only the first part appeared during our period, in 1737. A second part came out in 1741. But the stupendous work was never finished. As a monument of varied learning it is unique, and is one more instance of the intellectual stores in which the Church was peculiarly rich at this time. Dr. Johnson said of Warburton and his genius: "The table is always full, sir. He brings things from the north and the south, and from every quarter. In his *Divine Legation* you are always entertained. He carries you round and round, without carrying you forward to the point; but then you have no wish to be carried forward. . . . Warburton is, perhaps, the last man who has written with a mind full of reading and reflection."

Such were the main answers to the Deist writers, and if like the Deist writings most of them have perished or are forgotten, yet the residuum, the *Analogy*, is pure gold tried by the fire of over a hundred and fifty years.

AUTHORITIES.—In addition to the works cited at the end of the last chapter and in the text, consult Overton's *Life and Opinions of William Law, Non-Juror and Mystic;* Dean Bernard's edition of *Bishop Butler's Works, with Introduction and Notes*, 2 vols. (English Theological Library); W. E. Gladstone's *Studies subsidiary to Butler*, and the expansion of Butler's treatment of his subject in Bishop Barry's *Manifold Witness*, and Dr. Eagar's *Butler's Analogy and Modern Thought;* the *Life of Zachary Pearce*, by himself. Berkeley is best read in Professor Fraser's edition of the *Works*, and a full account of the *Alciphron* will be found in Fraser's *Berkeley* in the "Philosophical Classics" Series, to which indebtedness is gratefully acknowledged. Mandeville should be read with the Introduction by F. D. Maurice. See also William Law on *The Fable of the Bees.* An interesting application of Warburton's famous syllogism will be found in T. W. Fowle's *Divine Legation of Christ. The New Analogy*, by the same author, writing under the guise of "Cellanius," is worth studying.

CHAPTER V

JACOBITES AND NON-JURORS—THE BEGINNINGS OF SPIRITUAL REVIVAL

While the Church was thus rich in intellectual stores, in other, and not less valuable, stores it was very poor, and seemed to be growing poorer and poorer every day. On its moral and spiritual side, from which naturally springs practical work, it seemed as if a creeping paralysis were coming over it. One cause of this was what was called the Dynastic Controversy. It is provoking to think that a political question should have been one of the chief causes of its moral and spiritual decay. "If, as my lady says, all outward establishments are Babel, so is this establishment. Let it stand for me. I neither set it up, nor pull it down. But let you and I build the City of God," wrote John Wesley to Charles, who asked him a question about the Church establishment. Of what real consequence to the Church ought it to have been whether a George or a James, neither of whom had the slightest sympathy with it, was sitting on the throne? There were two factors, both having their roots in the history of the past, which made this question important from a Church point of view, and which explain the attitude of both leaders and people towards it. Many remembered that the Church had not fared well under the rule of James II., and conjectured, with a fair show of probability, that another Stewart king would be sure to follow the same policy, and to attack the Church as James II. had attacked it. England had not lost by any means her dread of popery, and was not prepared to see the authority of Rome again

The Dynastic Controversy.

asserted, and aided by the throne itself. The strong feeling against any such attempt had already been clearly manifested in the first election after the King's accession.

Anti-Roman feeling.

A Whig tract (1714) entitled *English Advice to Frenchmen* had stated the issue very plainly: "If you would lose your Protestant king, your religion, and your liberties, if you would have the Pretender, the Mass, and the wooden shoes, send his good friends, the Tories, to represent you. Can you imagine that one bred up by the most bigoted and tyrannical even of all Popish courts, and altogether a most bitter enemy to our religion and nation, would not, were it in his power, establish Popery, not out of conscience, but out of revenge for the treatment he has met with from the Protestant Church of England?" James's popery had cost him his throne, and men saw clearly that the Protestant succession was necessary to the purity and the liberties of the English Church.

On the other hand, the populace dreaded, perhaps, even more a return to Puritanism, and it was this which made the cry of "High Church" still a popular cry. The

Anti-Puritan feeling.

Roundhead was a much more objectionable person than the Cavalier in the eyes of the ordinary Englishman, and particularly in those of the ordinary Londoner, and a Stewart upon the throne might be preferable, even though he were a papist, to the churches filled with Puritan preachers and the interrupted rites of the Cromwellian interregnum. So that this question of James or George was not only a fruitful source of discord, which is never conducive to Christianity, but directly diverted the Church from its proper work, and that in various ways.

In the first place, it produced what may be called a class difference among the clergy which was fatal to that harmony without which little true work can be done. The great mass of the inferior clergy were in their heart of hearts in favour of James the Pretender, while the dignitaries, as in duty bound, were in favour of George as chief representative of the power that promoted, as well as being *de facto* king; and for this they had scriptural authority. Of the two Universities, in which all the clergy had been trained, Oxford especially, and Cambridge to a

Superior and inferior clergy.

greater extent than is commonly supposed, were honeycombed with Jacobitism, and the result was a growing alienation between the higher and the lower clergy. Nor was this all. Besides those who were Jacobites at heart, there were those who were Jacobites by open avowal; and these, again, were of two classes. First of all, there were the Non-Jurors, who were churchmen to the backbone in the spiritual sense of the term, but who were temporarily alienated from the national establishment. Their alienation was intensified greatly by the accession of the House of Hanover. It had seemed in a fair way of being healed when Queen Anne was reigning, but from the beginning of the Georgian era all hopes of their reconciliation disappeared. It is true that the party was not numerically large, but it contained within its ranks some of the very ablest and some also of the saintliest churchmen in the kingdom. Such men as Robert Nelson, Jeremy Collier, Nathaniel Spinckes, William Law, Charles Leslie, Thomas Baker, Thomas Brett, and dozens of lesser men were not plentiful in any Church in any age. And the worst of it was that they carried with them that element of the recognition of the principle of continuity, which was so grievously and glaringly lacking, that element which linked the Church of the Georgian era with the Church of the Primitive Fathers of the first three centuries. It was by one of this body that the first note of alarm was sounded which awoke the Church from her lethargy, as we shall see presently.

The Non-Jurors.

A distinction must be drawn between the Non-Jurors and the Jacobites. Of course, there were many who were both, but, on the other hand, many of the best of the Non-Jurors were not in any active sense of the term Jacobites, and many of the most active of the Jacobites were not Non-Jurors. These last, indeed, disliked the Non-Jurors, whose more consistent position, involving as it did the sacrifice of all that flesh holds dear, was a perpetual reproach. The Jacobites, however, who swallowed the oath, defended their conduct, not altogether unreasonably, on the ground that the whole question of sovereign power now turned not, as it ought to have done, upon hereditary right, but upon parliamentary settlement, and as Parliament settled,

The Jacobites.

so Parliament could unsettle the arrangement. It was not, therefore, wise or right to act the part of Achilles sulking in his tent for the loss of Briseis and leaving Agamemnon to have it all his own way, as the Non-Jurors did, but to fight the battle where alone it could be fought; and for that purpose it was necessary to take the oath. Among these men by far the most distinguished, in fact, their recognised leader, was Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster.

Francis Atterbury.

Francis Atterbury (1662-1732) had been a very prominent churchman long before the accession of King George. Indeed, by far the greater part of his busy public life belongs to the period treated of in an earlier volume of this work. He was one of Queen Anne's episcopal appointments, being made Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster (in those days the two offices often went together) in 1713. He made no secret of his wish that the Queen should be succeeded by her brother James. And whether or no the story be true that on her demise he offered to head a procession in his lawn sleeves to proclaim King James III. at Charing Cross, there is little doubt that he was extremely disappointed at the peaceful accession of George I., did all in his power to thwart the new Government, and thought that he could do so the more effectually by taking than by refusing the new oath. He had a very high reputation both as a preacher and as a parliamentary orator. Whatever else Atterbury was, he was a most staunch and consistent English churchman, being as much opposed to Romanism on the one hand as to Latitudinarianism on the other. He did not despair that King James III., as he called him, might still be won over to a better faith than that in which he had been brought up, while he did utterly despair of any good to the Church under King George I., the Whig politicians, and the Latitudinarian clergy with whom the new King had entirely identified himself. Almost all the other bishops in the House of Lords took the opposite side; all the more reason, therefore, so he thought, that he should stand as a sort of *Athanasius contra mundum*, to fight the battle.

It is necessary to lay stress upon this point, because

it appears on the surface that Atterbury was more of a statesman than a churchman. But this seems to be quite an erroneous view of his character. He was a statesman only because he thought that was the best way of showing that he was a churchman. As time went on matters seemed to him to be going more and more against the Church. Convocation, of which he had been a most ardent and courageous defender, was silenced. His old enemy Hoadly, whom he regarded as the most dangerous of all enemies to the Church, was promoted to the Bench. Quakers, whom he regarded as hardly Christians at all, were to have favours shown to them which were denied to churchmen. The Church was being betrayed by her own sons, the most untrustworthy of whom were continually being thrust into high places. Such considerations as these, which were ecclesiastical rather than political, led him to identify himself more and more with the Stewart cause.

When and to what extent Atterbury actually joined in conspiracies for the restoration of the ancient line, is a question for the political rather than for the ecclesiastical historian. But this at least seems clear, that the evidence against him would not have been strong enough to bear the test of a court of law. For when he was arrested in 1722, and brought before the Privy Council, the ministers determined that he should be tried by the very unsatisfactory process of a Bill of Penalties in the House of Commons. Atterbury refused to plead his cause before the Commons, declaring with dignity that he would plead it when it came before another House to which he had the honour to belong. Of course the Bill passed the Commons, the great majority of which was under the thumb of the all-powerful minister, Sir Robert Walpole, but there was considerable delay, for Atterbury was a prisoner in the Tower for seven months before he was summoned before the House of Lords and pleaded his cause with all the eloquence of which he was so consummate a master. The Bench of bishops was chiefly composed of Whig nominees, and all except one—Gastrell of Chester—were against him. The Bill passed, and Atterbury was again confined to the Tower, where he is said to have been harshly treated. From

Arrest and trial.

thence he was condemned and exiled for the rest of his life. He left England in 1723 and never returned. But although the Commons and the Lords were against him, the public was in his favour.

Popular sympathy.

It seemed as if there was to be a repetition of the Sacheverell disturbances. Prayers were offered for him when he was in prison, as for one suffering from severe sickness (for suffering from gout he was, in fact); a sensational picture of him looking through the bars of his prison, and holding in his hands a portrait of the martyred Archbishop Laud, was freely sold; and when he left the Tower for the last time he was attended by an admiring crowd which almost reminds us of the Seven Bishops in their progresses to and from the same grim fortress. There was a dramatic element about the whole story which was sure to impress the populace. The great preacher and speaker using that eloquence which had so often entranced crowds, in defence of his own liberty, perhaps of his life; the champion of the Church of England suffering for his consistency to its cause, and deserted by the fathers of the Church; the lonely old man going into perpetual exile for a cause with which very many, if not the majority, had in their hearts a strong sympathy—such things gave both the cause and the man an adventitious interest. To crown all, there came the touching story of his only daughter, with the stamp of death upon her, making a last effort to cross the sea to see her father in his exile, and arriving just in time to die in his arms, a story which Pope has immortalised in his Epitaph on Atterbury:—

Pope's Epitaph on Atterbury.

SHE.

Yes, we have lived—one pang and then we part!
May Heaven, dear father! now have all thy heart.
Yet, ah! how once we loved, remember still,
Till you are dust like me.

HE.

Dear shade, I will;
Then mix this dust with thine.—O spotless ghost!
O, more than fortune, friends, or country lost!
Is there on earth one care, one wish beside?
Yes—Save my country, Heaven!
—He said, and died.

Atterbury was an old man and a brave one, but he can hardly be regarded as either one of the great divines or one of the great saints in which the Church of England has been fruitful, and indeed only in a very modified sense can he be regarded as a Confessor in its behalf. His case has been dwelt upon chiefly as an illustration of the divergence that existed between the dignitaries and the general body of the clergy, and it may be added of the lay churchmen, which was one symptom of the Church's decadence.

Other symptoms meet us at every turn. The laudable scheme for building fifty-two new churches within the Bills of Mortality went on prosperously during the reign of Queen Anne and then, as we have already seen, gradually fell through. The numerous week-day services of which James Paterson gives us a satisfactory account in his *Pietas Londinensis* (1714) soon became a vanishing quantity. The religious societies, which were to a large extent responsible for these services, ceased to thrive. There was a perceptible lowering of the general tone of the clergy, and they certainly held a lower place in the general esteem. Bishop Secker complains with justice in his charge of 1738: "Christianity is now railed at and ridiculed with very little reserve, and the teachers of it without any at all. Against us our adversaries appear to have set themselves to be as bitter as they can, not only beyond all truth, but beyond all probability, exaggerating without mercy." Never since the Lollards had there been a time when the clergy were held in so much contempt, or when satire upon them was so welcome, as is shown by the pictures drawn of them in contemporary fiction. The contempt was not for the Church as a system, but for the persons, tone and temper, manners and morals of the clergy. Although no doubt there was a tendency to exaggeration in many of the pictures drawn, and further, a certain amount of wicked delight in drawing them on the part of their authors, yet they reveal a condition of things which can only be described as lamentable.

Signs of decay.

Popular satire of the clergy.

Many of the clergy had become the mere hangers-on of the families of the great. In the early years of the century domestic chaplains were very numerous, though

they became less common as the century advanced. When Boswell adduced it as an instance that "there was less religion in the nation than formerly," that "there used to be a chaplain in every great family, which we do not find now," he was well answered by Dr. Johnson, "Neither do you find any of the State servants in great families. There is a change in customs." But there was a deeper depth still. Between the nobleman and the chaplain who sat at his table below the salt there was at least the relation between patron and client, but between the parson who was simply the boon companion of the ignorant and sensual squire of the time there was no relation but the most material and worldly. There was, moreover, as Burnet had noted just before his death in 1715, a general slackness in the discharge of clerical duty, and the case grew worse as the century advanced. What we now know as a well-worked parish did not, of course, exist. Even the ordinary parts of parochial machinery were then wanting. And in what was done there was no zeal, no enterprise. The labouring classes were neglected. Parochial visitation was the exception, not the rule. Catechising of children and servants and apprentices on Sunday afternoons had fallen into disuse. Home missions were unknown, and foreign missions did not evoke much sympathy and response. A clergyman's work consisted almost solely in reading the Services and preaching on Sundays. In a word, though to this broad generalisation there were many individual exceptions, the Church system had become mechanical and dead. The valley was full of bones and they were very dry. No wonder, then, that the Church became unpopular.

Social status of the clergy.

Neglect of duty.

The worst of this unpopularity of the Church and clergy was that it weakened the most potent of all influences in the direction of religion and morality among the nation at large, and irreligion and immorality prevailed during this period to a fearful extent. Drunkenness increased among all classes, from the gentry, who prided themselves upon being "three-bottle men," to the very poor, who were tempted by the offer of the gin-sellers to make them drunk for a penny and to give them straw to lie upon. The amusements of the people were cruel and brutal. Cock-

General weakening of morals.

fighting, bull- and bear-baiting were in the height of their popularity, though manlier sports were not unknown by any means. Travellers agreed with coachmen that they were to wait a night if there was a cock-fight to be seen in any town they passed through, and large sums were staked upon the odd battle or final heat. The church bells even sometimes announced the winning of a "long main" or odd battle. The criminal law was responsible for a good deal of the general deadening of the conscience of the nation. Its punishments were barbarous, and it too often made but little discernment between small and great crimes. "No fewer than a hundred and sixty crimes," said Sir Samuel Romilly in his *Observations on a late Publication intituled "Thoughts upon Executive Justice,"* "have been declared by Act of Parliament to be felonies without benefit of clergy; or, in other words, to be worthy of instant death." These crimes, moreover, were not even scientifically regarded. To pick a pocket of only twelve pence and a farthing—anything over a shilling—was punishable with death, whereas an attempt at parricide was only a misdemeanour.

Popular amusements.

Criminal law.

The gallows was one of the commonest sights in London and its neighbourhood. There were many of them, sometimes close together, and they were in almost every quarter, while the scenes attending executions, with the procession to the gallows, the accompanying crowds of admirers and friends, the bravado exhibited by many of the criminals, the farewell speeches, the general tone of the whole procedure, more like that of a popular entertainment than of a solemn act of justice, have been well exhibited by Hogarth in his "Industry and Idleness." There were few signs of any revolt on the part of the public against such spectacles. Strange as it may seem, there were worse things than public hangings. Women were burnt instead of being hanged. The cases were numerous and are on record, and they lasted certainly up till 1789. The law was altered in 1790. In addition to which there were the punishments of the pillory, which were erected in several of the important streets in the City of London, as well as in many outside its boundaries. Whipping, too, was

Executions.

Burnings of women.

common both in public and in private. Villages had their whipping-post hard by the stocks. Men and women alike were whipped either at the post or by being tied to the back of a cart which was slowly driven through the streets. The registers of Barnstaple contain a long list of women condemned to be whipped. Let two entries suffice. "Grace Rodgers to be whipped next Friday till her body is bloody." "Elizabeth, the wife of Humphry Britton, to be severely whipped from the prison to Northgate next market-day, from the hour of ten to twelve, till her back is bloody, and from thence back to prison." These entries are typical of many others. Truly an edifying spectacle! There was indeed sore need of a moral and spiritual revival, and symptoms of its approach may be found before the limits of this chapter are reached. Whether, when it came, it took the form which an attached and earnest churchman would desire is another question, which will be answered by the sequel.

Whipping.

The first symptom of an approaching change may be found in the interest taken in the two practical works of William Law, viz. *A Practical Treatise upon Christian Perfection*, published in 1726, and *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life, adapted to the State and Condition of all Orders of Christians*, 1728. They passed through many editions, and there is hardly a leader in the Evangelical revival who does not express his obligations to one or other of them, or to both. But, oddly enough, though Law was thus a prime agent in setting the ball a-rolling, he did not follow its course,—not that he was the least inconsistent with himself in failing so to do. Beyond their general earnestness and piety, there is not a word in either of these two books to show that the writer was in sympathy with the principles of either of the two sections of the Evangelical revival, and both complained later, and from their point of view justly, that there was too little of the Gospel in either of the treatises. In fact, when he wrote them, he was distinctly a High churchman, and though his churchmanship was considerably modified by his subsequent adoption of mystical views, these did not bring him nearer to, but rather alienated him further from the Methodists and the Evangelicals. But, underlying all questions of High or Low churchmanship, was

William Law's practical works.

the deeper question, Are you trying to live the Christian life? This was the question which Law pushed home with wonderful force and vigour in both these works. More than any man he combined the intellectual with the spiritual side of religion. In intellect Law is not unworthy to be ranked by the side of Butler and Waterland; in spirituality he will bear comparison with Wesley and Whitefield. But, except by his writings, he took no part in active Church life during the period before us. We must therefore pass on from him to others who to a certain extent may be regarded as his pupils.

The Oxford Methodists.

About the year 1729 a little society was formed at Oxford which in its object and constitution did not differ from many other such little societies not uncommon at the universities. The object was mutual edification, and the chief founder was named Charles Wesley, a junior Student of Christ Church. He gathered round him a small band of like-minded young men who read together, on week-days the classics, and on Sundays divinity, and made a point of attending most punctually at the means of grace. Presently, his elder brother, John Wesley, who had then been Fellow of Lincoln for three years, returned to Oxford from having been his father's curate at Epworth and Wroot; and John, from his age and university standing, was naturally accepted as the head of the society, which henceforth met in his rooms at Lincoln. This is his simple account of the matter:—

"In the year 1725 a young student at Oxford was much affected by reading Kempis' *Christian Pattern* and Bishop Taylor's *Rules of Holy Living and Dying*. He formed an earnest desire to live according to those rules, and to flee from the wrath to come. He sought for some that would be his companions in the way, but could find none; so that for several years he was constrained to travel alone, having no man either to guide or to help him. But in the year 1729 he found one who had the same desire. They then endeavoured to help each other, and, in the close of the year, were joined by two more. They soon agreed to spend two or three hours together every Sunday evening. Afterwards they sat two evenings together, and, in a while, six evenings in the week, spending that time in reading the Scriptures and

provoking one another to love and to good works. The regularity of their behaviour gave occasion to a young gentleman of the College to say, 'I think we have got a new set of *Methodists*,'—alluding to a set of physicians who began to flourish at Rome about the time of Nero, and continued for several ages." But Charles Wesley says that the name of Methodist "was bestowed upon himself and his friends because of their strict conformity to the method of study prescribed by the statutes of the University," and this seems a much more likely explanation; for what would a giddy undergraduate know about a set of physicians in the time of Nero? In another passage John Wesley also gives this as an alternative explanation.

Wesley's narrative.

"The name was," Wesley continues, "new and quaint; it clave to them immediately; and from that time both those four young gentlemen, and all that had any religious connexion with them, were distinguished by the name of *Methodists*. In the four or five years following, another and another were added to the number, till in the year 1735 there were fourteen of them who constantly met together. Three of these were tutors in their several colleges; the rest Bachelors of Arts or undergraduates. They were all precisely of one judgment as well as of one soul; all tenacious of order to the last degree, and observant, for conscience' sake, of every rule of the Church, and every statute both of the university and of their respective colleges. They were all orthodox in every point, firmly believing not only the Three Creeds, but whatsoever they judged to be the doctrine of the Church of England, as contained in her Articles and Homilies. As to that practice of the Apostolic Church (which continued till the time of Tertullian, at least in many Churches), the having all things in common, they had no rule, nor any formed design concerning it; but it was so in effect, and it could not be otherwise, for none could want anything that another could spare. This was the infancy of the work. They had no conception of anything that would follow. Indeed, they took 'no thought for the morrow,' desiring only to live to-day."

In 1730 they began visiting the prisoners in gaol and the sick, and to the Wesleys' great satisfaction they received the hearty approval of their father at Epworth. The original four

were John Wesley, Fellow of Lincoln; Charles Wesley, Student of Christ Church; William Morgan, a commoner of Christ Church; and Robert Kirkham of Merton. Then they were gradually joined by a few others: in 1731 by John Gambold, servitor of Christ Church, afterwards one of the bishops of the Unitas Fratrum, or Moravian Church; in 1732 by John Clayton of Brasenose, Benjamin Ingham of Queen's, Thomas Broughton of Exeter, and Westley Hall of Lincoln; in 1733 by James Hervey of Lincoln, author of the *Meditations among the Tombs*; and afterwards by John Kinchin, Fellow of Corpus; John Whitelamb of Lincoln; Richard Hutchins, Fellow and afterwards Rector of Lincoln; and finally by George Whitefield, a poor servitor of Pembroke. Wesley's colleagues.

The mere fact that fifteen young men, just at the time when life seemed most enjoyable, and in a place where of all others it may be most enjoyed, should band together for so self-denying a course is an indication, to which many others might be added, that even in this dead time the spirit of religion had not quite died out. The fire was not extinguished. It only required fanning into a flame. But their treatment also illustrates how rough and coarse the times were. In a place specially devoted to the training of future clergy, a few inoffensive young men could not attend the highest service of the Church without scoffs and jeers from others who were presumably being trained for the ministry of the same Church.

The same conclusions are drawn from the early life of the two most distinguished of the group. They had been trained in habits of piety by their good father and their incomparable mother (for "the true founder of Wesleyanism was Mrs. Wesley") in that quiet country parsonage in Lincolnshire,[1] where the parson did his best to work for God for nearly forty years. There were many more such workers in the days of George I. and George II., and their record is on high. It is only by making curious investigation here and there that we can find traces of them. But, on the other hand, the story of Samuel Wesley at Epworth also illustrates the coarseness and brutality of the times. Wesley's parents.

[1] It may perhaps be pointed out, for the sake of those who do not know the fact, that the late Canon Overton was himself Rector of Epworth from 1883 to 1897.

He was badly treated by his parishioners, who cheated him of his dues and tithes, houghed his cattle, and it is more than probable set fire to his house, without any fair provocation on his part.

Two important measures were brought before Parliament in 1736, and indicate the position at this period of the question of Toleration, which was later to come more prominently to the front. The first was the Mortmain Bill, "to prevent the further alienation of lands by will in mortmain." The second was "for the more easy recovery of tithes from Quakers." The older laws, which had provided a cheap method of recovering tithes, were not compulsive, and it was therefore still in the power of the clergy to carry their cases to the ecclesiastical courts or to that of the Exchequer, and so to mulct the Quakers in heavy fines or possible imprisonment. The new Bill was intended as a measure of relief to the Quakers by making the proceedings against them briefer and less costly. Both Bills passed the Commons by large majorities and had the strong and warm support of Walpole. But they were thrown out by the Lords. The old cry of "The Church in danger" was raised by the bishops. Gibson, Bishop of London, led the opposition, and fourteen other bishops and the Lord Chancellor voted against the Quaker Bill. Walpole was very irritated, and Gibson lost his confidence as chief adviser in ecclesiastical matters. In fact, it cost Gibson the primacy, and Lord Hervey says that "the Court was very angry with the bishops for trying to revive the long-deadened spirit of Church quarrels by sending circular letters through their dioceses to alarm the clergy about the Mortmain and Quaker Bills."

Mortmain and Quaker Bills.

In the later years of this period an influence was brought to bear upon the disposal of Church patronage which on the whole was beneficial. At any rate, it was better than the influence of Sir Robert Walpole. Though she was strongly Low Church and Erastian, Queen Caroline, the clever wife of George II., took a deep and intelligent interest in Church questions, both when she was Princess of Wales and when she was Queen. Perhaps she puzzled her brain a little too much with them and was not quite orthodox, though the testimony on such facts of mere

Queen Caroline.

worldlings like Horace Walpole and Lord Hervey, our main informants, must be regarded with the gravest suspicion. As a matter of fact, the Church is indebted to Caroline for some of the very best bishops of the time, men who would have been an honour to the Bench in any age. It was through her recommendation that Joseph Butler, Thomas Secker, Thomas Sherlock, John Potter, and George Berkeley were made bishops; and it was not her fault that the apostolic Thomas Wilson was not translated from his island-see to a wider and more important sphere in England, but simply because the good man was wedded to the bishopric which he adored, and refused "to leave his wife in his old age because she was poor."

The death of the Queen in 1737 prevented her from seeing the fruit of her labours, but the admirable Bishop of Gloucester, Martin Benson, who did not even owe his elevation to her, said no more than the truth when he wrote to the no less admirable Bishop Berkeley: "The Queen's death is a severe blow. Those who would not be persuaded while she lived how sincere a friend she was to our Church and Constitution, have since her death been fully persuaded of it." The death of this remarkable woman brings us pretty nearly to the end of our period. She died November 20, 1737, and the spring of 1738 introduces us to a new period in our history.

AUTHORITIES.—Canon Overton's *The Non-Jurors, their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (1902) supplements but does not supersede the earlier work of Lathbury. The Life of Atterbury has yet to be written. See, however, the article in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and an excellent account of him by Canon H. C. Beeching in *Cornhill*, August 1905. William Law's works are readily consulted in the modern nine-volume edition of Moreton. See also Christopher Walton's (unpublished) *Notes and Materials for a Biography of William Law*. It is very occasionally to be procured second-hand at a rather high price. Each copy contains manuscript emendations and additions from the hand of the author. There is a unique collection (made by Walton) of works relating to William Law in Dr. Williams's Library. John Wesley's *Journal* (of which a new and more complete edition is promised) is the authority on himself and his work. Tyerman's *Life* (published in 1870) is full and accurate. Julia Wedgwood's *John Wesley* (also published in 1870) has more insight than Tyerman and ought to be reprinted. Tyerman's *The Oxford Methodists* gives a full account of the other members of the Oxford Society. The *Somers Tracts*, vol. xiii., are valuable as showing the political feeling during this period, as are also Lord Hervey's *Memoirs of the Reign of George II.* for Queen Caroline and her influence.

SECOND PERIOD, 1738–1760

CHAPTER VI

THE EARLY PHASES OF THE WESLEYAN MOVEMENT

Intellectual and spiritual forces.

WHEN the year 1738 set in it was assuredly high time that the emotional (as distinguished from the intellectual) element in Christianity should have its due prominence given to it, that the appeal should be made to the heart as well as to the head. The assailants of Christianity from all quarters had effectually been disposed of by the work of its champions, culminating in the masterpiece of Bishop Butler, and it should never be forgotten that without that work what followed could never have happened. There has been far too great a tendency to look down as from an eminence upon the Apologists or evidence-writers, to treat them as mere scavengers who, at best, only cleared away the rubbish before the great work of erecting the spiritual fabric began. It is the old story of the swinging back of the pendulum. The intellectual aids having perhaps been rated too high, began to be rated too low, and it is not until we come to the closing years of the century that we find Christian apologetics of anything like the same value as those we noticed in a former chapter.

Meanwhile, however, the Apologists had done their work, and another kind of work was urgently needed. To use the striking and apposite simile of a modern writer,[1]

[1] Bishop Fitzgerald on *The Study of the Evidences of Christianity* in "Aids to Faith," p. 43.

the state of the Church was like that of a prince who employs all his time and strength and resources in raising fortresses about a territory which he does not carefully govern; or like a landlord who lives but to accumulate muniments of an estate which he neglects to till. Christianity on its speculative side had been proved up to the hilt. Christianity on its practical side was becoming less and less a motive force for life and action. This anomalous state could not long continue. Given that Christianity is proved, it must exercise a practical influence. The change was bound to come, and the turn of the tide may fairly be dated from the year 1738; for though many qualifications, exceptions, and explanations may be needed, still, broadly speaking, John Wesley must surely be regarded as the prime mover of the Evangelical revival, and it was not till 1738 that John Wesley's life-work really began.

Before touching upon the career of this remarkable man, two cautions must be given:—1. If any one expects that from the beginning of the Evangelical revival in its earlier form of Methodism, an improvement in the state of the Church will be perceptible, he will be disappointed. It is quite the reverse. The immediate effects of Methodism upon the Church were rather to make churchmen set their faces all the more against the religion of feeling than to attract them to it; and though it is difficult to generalise on such a subject, the state of religion in the Church does not appear to have been any better at the end of our second period than it was at the beginning. 2. When John Wesley is placed at the head of those who directed men's thoughts from the intellectual to the emotional side of Christianity, it is not meant that he made light of intellect. He was far too sensible to do that. He was a highly trained man, and kept himself well abreast of all the intellectual movements of the day. But, like all those who sympathised with the Evangelical revival, he held that it required another faculty than reason to apprehend religious truth. "Go on, gentlemen," he said to the Deists, in writing to Dr. Middleton, "and prosper. Shame these nominal Christians out of that poor superstition which they call Christianity. Reason, rally, laugh them out

First result of Methodism.

John Wesley and learning.

of their dead empty forms, void of spirit, of faith and love. Press on, push your victories, till you have conquered all that know not God. And then He, Whom neither they nor you know now, shall rise and gird Himself with strength, and go forth in His almighty love, and sweetly conquer you altogether."

The Wesleyan Society.

The Society of which John Wesley was the founder hardly comes within our scope. The oft-told tale of his wonderful life and of the equally wonderful organisation he established, which has now attained to such gigantic proportions, penetrating into all parts of the world, need not here be repeated. It is told in a hundred books, which are, of course, in substantial agreement as to the main facts, though they differ widely as to the inferences to be drawn from those facts. Moreover, it is impossible not to come to the conclusion that from the very first the Wesleyan movement, so far as it concerned organisation, never was and never could have been a Church movement. It is, of course, true that both John and Charles Wesley were themselves churchmen, and never for one moment desired any separation from the Church; nay, that they both ardently and even passionately deprecated any such separation. It is also true that almost all the chief leaders were clergymen of the Church of England. George Whitefield, John Fletcher, Thomas Coke, the two Wesleys, Vincent Perronet, Vicar of Shoreham (1693-1785)—take away these, and what becomes of early Methodism? It is a body without a head. It is also true that the United Societies were intended by John Wesley to be handmaids, not rivals, helps and not hindrances, in fact continuations of the religious societies with which he had been familiar from his youth, and which were really what his own Societies are supposed to have been. It has frequently been asserted indeed, though never satisfactorily proved, that John Wesley himself so regarded them.

Methodism and the religious societies.

Precautions were taken to keep these religious societies within Church lines, which were wholly absent in Wesley's rules. Thus the rules of Anthony Horneck of the Savoy Chapel provided that the Church prayers were to be read; a psalm might be sung; religious discourse was optional, controversy was strictly forbidden; the subject for discussion was to be practical,

and was to be chosen by the clergyman. Each member paid 6d. to the alms-box at every weekly meeting, and on Whit-Tuesday the money was distributed among the poor. The rules of life commended to all members called upon them to love one another, to speak evil of no man, to wrong no man, to pray, if possible, seven times a day, to keep close to the Church of England. They were called upon to communicate regularly. In Paterson's account of the London churches, also, mention is made of regular weekly services, of services in preparation for Holy Communion, and of weekly or monthly lectures, kept up in each case by a religious society.

It is true that Wesley's commanding influence not only prevented any formal separation from the Church during his lifetime, but also secured the punctual attendance, at least for some time, at the public worship in the parish churches "of all" (to use his own expression) "who regarded his opinion"; that is, in other words, of all Methodists, for with them his word was law. But all this seems beside the mark. The real question is, What was the tendency of the movement from the very beginning? Where did the followers of Wesley find their religion? Where was the true motive power? Surely not in the Church system, but in their own separate organisations. It is fully admitted that they were often repelled where they should have been welcomed, and that John Wesley especially was misunderstood both as to his motives and as to his measures. But is it possible that almost everybody, outside the select circle, which was at first a very small one, should have been utterly mistaken as to the meaning of it all? It is purely a modern notion that the Wesleyan movement ever was, or ever was intended to be, except by Wesley, a Church movement. Contemporary writers of all classes seem to be agreed on this point—the excellent Walker of Truro, an Evangelical before Evangelicalism, and John Berridge, the eccentric Vicar of Everton, in Bedfordshire, whose church was the scene of many of Wesley's labours, not less than Butler and Sherlock and Warburton and Lavington. The testimony of such men as Walker and Berridge, who were assuredly not prejudiced against what may be called emotionalism, is

Separatist tendency.

of peculiar value in settling this point. Take the following passage in a letter from John Berridge to Lady Huntingdon: "What will become of your students at your decease? They are virtual dissenters, and will be settled dissenters then. And the same will happen to many, perhaps most, of Mr. Wesley's preachers at his death. He rules like a real Alexander, and is now stepping forth like a flaming torch; but we do not read in history of two Alexanders succeeding each other."

The whole correspondence between Samuel Walker and the Wesleys in 1755 and 1756 shows plainly that in Walker's opinion Methodism, even in that early stage of it, was already virtually a separation from the Church. Samuel Wesley, the elder brother of John and Charles Wesley, though he lived to see only the infancy of the movement, perceived its drift when he wrote: "I am not afraid that the Church will excommunicate him (discipline is at too low an ebb for that), but that he [John Wesley] will excommunicate the Church. It is pretty near it. Holiness and good works are not so much as *conditions* of our acceptance with God. Love-feasts are introduced, and extemporary prayers, and expositions of Scripture, which last are enough to bring in all confusion; nor is it likely they will want any miracles to support them."

Early signs of separatism.

Absurd as the expression "he will excommunicate the Church" may sound, it indicates, of course in an exaggerated form, what actually happened, if not on the part of the Wesleys themselves, at least on the part of many of their followers. If the ordinary churchmen did not agree with John Wesley, not merely in his establishment of societies but in the doctrines he taught, then, despite all his tolerance and churchmanship, he refused to regard them even as Christians, save in a very limited sense of the term. The gulf was bound to grow wider and wider, and would have done so even if the Church had been as lenient with him as very frequently it was in its turn intolerant. Wesley was a man of fixed and uncompromising opinions, and though in some cases he could be sympathetic and work with others, yet real vital union, save on impossible terms, became more and more impossible.

Nothing existed to prevent individual churchmen from becoming associated with him. There was no essential

doctrinal difference between him and the Church. But the difficulty lay in himself and in his methods, and he could not have accepted the organised support of the English Church any more than the Church of that day could have honestly worked with him. And all this, as has been said, was seen by many almost from the very first. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that so early as 1738 he was "almost universally excluded from the pulpits of the Established Church. I was forbidden, as by a general consent, to preach in any church (though not by any judicial sentence)." It is not clear whether this refers to London only, as being the chief scene of his labours, or to the country as a whole. He did preach in London nevertheless, and by so doing, not in the churches but wherever he could find a place, he began that movement of schism which afterwards was accentuated by his ministers administering the Holy Communion and by his so-called ordination of ministers for Scotland and America. So that although he himself remained a communicating churchman, and when possible an authorised preacher in Church pulpits, until his death, and declared solemnly that he had no intention of seceding, and further, advised his followers not to secede, yet by his action in invading the parishes of the parochial clergy against their will, and disregarding all admonitions, episcopal or clerical, on the matter, and later by setting up altar against altar, and by professing to be able to ordain men (even though ordained for Scotland and America) who should be regarded as equally commissioned to perform clerical functions with those upon whom episcopal hands had been laid, and who had received ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction as sanction for their work, he did practically inaugurate a schismatical movement, as the later history clearly proves.

Movement towards schism.

For there were grave reasons apart from those just named which prevented many sober-minded clergymen from giving their sanction to Wesley's preaching. The physical manifestations which followed some sermons were, it is true, not confined to his ministrations, but are found also in connexion with John Berridge and Whitefield, yet still they were not likely to meet with approval, especially in that age, and they were everyday occurrences during his stay in Bristol. We

read, for example, in his *Journal* for April 26, 1739: "At Newgate [Bristol] I was led to pray that God would bear witness to His word. Immediately one, and another, and another sank to the earth; they dropped on every side as if thunderstruck. One of them cried aloud. We besought God on her behalf and He turned her heaviness into joy. A second being in the same agony, we called upon God for her also; and He spoke peace unto her soul. In the evening one was so wounded by the sword of the Spirit, that you would have imagined she could not live for a moment. But immediately His abundant kindness was shown, and she loudly sang of His righteousness." Or again at Wapping: "Some sank down, and there remained no strength in them; others exceedingly trembled and quaked. Some were torn with a kind of convulsive motion in every part of their bodies, and that so violently that often four or five persons could not hold one of them." On another occasion: "While I was speaking, one before me dropped down as dead, and presently a second and a third. Five others sank down in half-an-hour, most of whom were in violent agonies. We called upon the Lord, and He gave us an answer of peace. One, indeed, continued an hour in strong pain, and one or two more for three days. But the rest were greatly comforted." Wesley himself believed that these were forms of madness which were not natural but diabolical, and declared that he had seen men and women literally possessed with devils, nay, that he had himself experienced visitations of a supernatural agency. His followers took the same line, and on one occasion, though at a later date in 1788, in the Temple Church at Bristol, seven clergymen exorcised seven devils out of an epileptic named George Lukins of Yatton.

Physical phenomena.

Can it be wondered at that the Church of the Hanoverian rule was shocked and was unable to find a place for Wesley's methods? Would the Church of our own day act very differently? Would the majority of the existing Wesleyan bodies? What has been said of John Wesley applies with still greater force to George Whitefield. The Wesleys were at least churchmen personally, but Whitefield scarcely, and, as his latest biographer frankly owns, he was in a false position as

a clergyman. On the other hand, he was not the founder of a sect, and in a sense may fairly be regarded as a progenitor of the Evangelical party in the Church of England. But he himself can hardly be regarded as other than a free lance who happened to be a clergyman by profession. "He was a clergyman of the Church of England, but also practically an Independent minister." It must be clearly understood that, in touching but lightly upon the indefatigable and self-denying labours of these great and good men, the object is not to depreciate their labours, but simply to keep to the proper subject of this volume, and, so far as possible, to indicate the position in which they and their immediate followers stood with relation to the Church of England.

George Whitefield's position.

John Wesley (1703-1791) was born at Epworth, the chief place in the Isle of Axholme in Lincolnshire, on June 17 (o.s.), 1703. His father, Samuel Wesley, was rector of the parish for nearly forty years, and John's early home training was admirably adapted to fit him for his future work. He was brought up in an atmosphere of piety, his early education being mainly conducted by his gifted, saintly mother, Susanna Wesley, who was a strict but most loving instructress. He was of gentle blood on both sides, and he bore traces of it all his long life. This may seem quite a secondary consideration, and hardly worth noting, but it had a very considerable influence. He could hold his own with the highest classes on perfectly equal terms. And it certainly added to his influence over people of humbler position, who, as none know better than those who work among the poor, have a keen perception and appreciation of good breeding. At the same time, he was far from being delicately nurtured. With a large family and a small income, the Rector of Epworth was always in straitened circumstances, and sometimes in actual distress. So John from his earliest years was accustomed to rough it. In 1709, when he was six years old, he was all but burned to death in a disastrous fire which consumed the rectory. His narrow escape made a lasting impression upon him, and beneath one of his later portraits he wrote, obviously with a twofold meaning, the words, "Am I not a brand snatched from the burning?"

John Wesley.

Other circumstances connected with the life at Epworth seem to have affected his after career. The rector represented the clergy of the diocese in Convocation, and was on one occasion detained so long in London on Convocation business, that Mrs. Wesley felt that she ought to do something for the souls of the people. Accordingly she obtained her husband's leave, and held religious meetings at the rectory, which proved more attractive than the Church services. Is it too much to believe that John remembered the success of these meetings when, with some misgivings, he sanctioned the services conducted outside the church walls in after days? Again, the famous Epworth ghost, which has never been explained satisfactorily, and which was firmly believed in by the whole family, was perhaps responsible for that vein of credulity which always ran through John Wesley's mind. And once more, Epworth was a singularly remote place, and specially so for a clergyman; for it is in a far corner of the diocese to which it belonged, and from which also it is cut off by the rapidly-flowing river Trent. To this day the people of Epworth speak of "going into Lincolnshire," Yorkshire being, in fact, much more accessible. But the clergy are naturally drawn to their own, not to other dioceses. There were also very few resident gentry in the neighbourhood. So the family at Epworth rectory were cut off to a great degree from any intercourse with their equals. This early isolation may account for that guilelessness, simplicity, and liability to be imposed upon, in John Wesley, which made his brother Charles say, "My brother was born for the benefit of knaves."

Life at Epworth.

In 1713 John was sent to the Charterhouse School, and in 1720 was entered at Christ Church, Oxford. His life, both at a public school and as an undergraduate, may well have tended to blunt the fine edge of his religious feelings; for in the eighteenth century both our public schools and our universities were in a far from satisfactory state. So, when the time came for him to receive holy orders, he had scruples, which were, however, removed by his mother. In 1726 he was elected to a Smithsonian fellowship at Lincoln College, which he retained until his unfortunate marriage in 1751 to a widow of low birth, named Mary Vazeille, with whom he lived unhappily. For a short time he

Oxford life.

lived in college, taking part in college work, but in 1727 returned to "the Isle" and acted as curate to his father, who had now accepted the charge of Wroot (or Wroth) as well as of Epworth. In 1729 he was summoned back to Oxford, where his services were needed at Lincoln College. He found there the little society of Oxford Methodists formed by his brother Charles, and heartily entered into its spirit. His own account of its origin has been given in the last chapter. He remained at Oxford for some years, and his religious impressions, which were then of a more decidedly High Church cast than before, were much deepened, partly, no doubt, through the influence of William Law, though it is difficult to trace out fully the relationships between the two. Wesley, however, had evidently a very great respect for Law, which subsequent divergences of opinion, though they were wide, never impaired.

Then came the mission to Georgia, which was undertaken with the sanction both of Law and of his mother, but which will more fitly come before us in the chapter on missionary work. It may suffice to say here that his sense of failure, when he returned a disappointed and dispirited man, prepared the way for that memorable event which occurred on May 24, 1738, and can only be narrated in his own words. Peter Böhler, the famous Moravian preacher, had already taken the place which Law perhaps once held as "a kind of oracle" with him, and Wesley attended a meeting of a little religious society which had been founded by Böhler in Aldersgate Street, where, Wesley says, "a person read Luther's *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans*, which teaches what justifying faith is. I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death; and then I testified openly to all there what I now first felt in my heart." Soon after this, but not immediately, Wesley became permanently settled in his mind as regards his spiritual state, and continued so to the end of his long life; and from 1738 onwards he devoted himself to his wonderful career of activity, during which he is said to have travelled 250,000 miles, when travel-

Georgia.

Conversion.

ling was slow, difficult, and dangerous, and to have preached 40,000 sermons. There is only one explanation of this which is at all adequate to the known facts of the case, and that is very simple and obvious, and one which he himself gave when he said in his old age: "I entered into my eightieth year; but, blessed be God, my time is not 'labour and sorrow.' I find no more pain or bodily infirmities than at five-and-twenty. This I still impute—1. To the power of God, fitting me for what He calls me to. 2. To my still travelling four or five thousand miles a year. 3. To my sleeping, night or day, whenever I want it. 4. To my rising at a set hour. And, 5, to my constant preaching, particularly in the morning."

The biography which still retains, and always will retain, its place as the classical one misses the mark when it suggests ambition or the love of power as the stimulus which urged him. It was not to found a sect or to make himself a name, but to promote the love of God, and of man for God's sake, to restore the Divine image in the soul of man. His sole quarrel was with Satan, and Wesley's sole desire was to promote the glory of God and the spiritual welfare of man. He frequently made mistakes, but they were mistakes of the head and not of the heart. If ever there was a poor fallible man whose aims were uniformly noble and disinterested, that man was John Wesley.

Charles Wesley.

Charles Wesley (1708-1788) cannot be separated from John. It is an error to regard him merely as the "sweet singer" of the movement. He took his full share in the work in other ways, and John Wesley recognises it. When he recounts the origin and course of the movement, as he frequently does, he uses the expression, "My brother and I." Neither was Charles merely the faint shadow of John. He had an independent will of his own and could make it felt on occasion. In fact, Charles influenced John quite as much as John influenced Charles, though, of course, the difference of nearly six years in their ages led the younger, especially in his early years, to pay a certain deference to the elder. In point of education and attainments they were equal. Charles was educated at Westminster, where he had the advantage of the super-

intendence of his eldest brother Samuel, at that time a master in the school. Thence he was elected to a Westminster studentship at Christ Church, and in due time to a senior studentship, which was the same position as that held by a fellow of another college. When the revival of 1738 began, Charles became as effective a preacher and an evangelical itinerant as John, but he had not the same organising powers, and was not so obviously a born ruler of men. He knew this; for during the dangerous illness of John in 1753 he told the Societies with true Wesley frankness that he neither could nor would stand in his brother's place, if it pleased God to take him [John], for he had neither a body, nor a mind, nor talents, nor grace for it.

On the other hand, Charles was far less easily imposed upon than John. He was always suspicious of the physical excitement which attended the early preaching of Methodism, and never encouraged it, as John at one time was apt to do. He never became involved in awkward relations with the other sex, which was often the case with John, and which in a man less transparently guileless would certainly have given rise to unpleasant construction. No widow Vazeille would ever have entrapped him. He married as became his position and character, and was as happy in his choice as his brother was unhappy. He thought that John was far too much influenced by his preachers, and told him so plainly. He was not a more attached, but a far more consistent churchman than John, and on more than one occasion kept John firm when otherwise he would have given way. He perceived, long before John, the inevitable tendency of the Societies to drift away from the Church, and warned him of it repeatedly. But the two brothers loved each other dearly, and were thoroughly agreed in their general aims. They sometimes used language to one another which seemed as if they were on the verge of a quarrel. But that was only the Wesley way of speaking, which was sharp, curt, and direct. This, it may be observed, gave rise to the idea that John was arbitrary and overbearing, when all that it meant was that he was speaking after the manner of all the Wesleys, father, mother, brothers, and sisters alike.

The great service which Charles Wesley rendered to

the cause was through his wonderful gift of sacred song, which John Wesley thoroughly appreciated. He called the Methodist Hymn-Book, to which Charles Wesley contributed the lion's share, "a body of experimental and practical divinity," and wrote with pardonable pride about the psalmody of the Methodists: "when it is seasonable to sing praises to God, they do it with the spirit and the understanding also, not in the miserable, scandalous doggerel of Hopkins and Sternhold, but in psalms and hymns which are both sense and poetry, such as would sooner provoke a critic to turn Christian than a Christian to turn critic." The last clause of this sentence was borrowed from John Byrom. It is characteristic of Charles Wesley's strong churchmanship that the special hymns for the chief Church seasons—Christmas, Easter, and Ascensiontide—are his composition, to say nothing of his sacramental hymns, which certainly express high sacramental views, as the following extracts will show:—

Charles Wesley's hymns.

We need not now go up to Heaven
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost e'en now Thy Banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And shew Thy real Presence here.

Now on the Sacred Table laid
Thy Flesh becomes our Food,
Thy life is to our souls conveyed
In Sacramental Blood.

The way Thou hast enjoined
Thou wilt therein appear:
We come with confidence to find
Thy special Presence here.

The Lamb His Father now surveys
As on this Altar slain,
Still pleading and imploring grace
For every soul of man.

From the point of view of this work, which is strictly limited to the Church of England, the other Methodists only require a very short notice, for with the exception of Fletcher,

they had none of the Church feeling and Church predilections of John and Charles Wesley. What is necessary to be said about that great preacher and good man, George Whitefield, will come in more appropriately in connexion with the Evangelical party in the Church, of which he was, in a certain sense, the precursor.

John William Fletcher (1729-1785), "Fletcher of Madeley," as he is generally called from the scene of his labours, was a most saintly man, a man of whom any religious community might justly be proud, and one whom the Church of England might justly welcome, not only as one of her members, but as one of her ordained ministers. Nor did he ever, so far as we are aware, write or say one single syllable which was in the slightest degree inconsistent with his position as a beneficed priest of that Church, or ever join in that abuse of the clergy which was only too common among some of the early Methodists. He was of all men the one whom John Wesley admired and respected most. When Wesley appeared likely to die in 1773, his heart's desire was that Fletcher should succeed him as leader of the Methodists, and in writing to him on the question, Wesley sketched his ideal of what his successor should be, and so sketched Fletcher. He was to be a man of faith and love, and one that had a single eye to the advancement of the kingdom of God; a man of clear understanding, with a knowledge of men and things and particularly of the Methodist doctrine and discipline; a man of ready utterance, diligence, and activity, with a tolerable share of health. He needed, moreover, one who would be in favour with the people and who had some degree of learning. Wesley then asked: "But has God provided one so qualified? Who is he? *Thou art the man!*" So, on the other hand, Fletcher was one of the very few parish clergy who understood John Wesley and his work. He was pained at the manner in which Wesley was isolated by his brethren, and was at one time disposed to join him, not "with any view of presiding over the Methodists after you, but to ease you a little in your old age, and to be in the way of receiving, perhaps doing, more good."

John Fletcher.

Fletcher was a man of such transparent simplicity and sanctity of spirit that many things which he said and did

would have been grotesque and coarse in grosser natures. He had what Wesley termed "a facility of raising useful observations from the most trifling incidents." To him the lower things of life inevitably suggested the higher, and in this he shared the spirit of the true mystic. He told his cook "to stir up the fire of divine love in her soul," and his housemaid "to sweep every corner of her heart." He thanked one who made him a present of a new coat with an elaborate statement concerning the broadcloth of commerce and the robe of the righteousness of Christ, and even went so far as to use the sacred words of reception in the Communion Service, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," when he offered to his friends the customary hospitality of his vicarage. He stands out, too, in an age characterised by preferment-hunting as one to whom advancement had no charm. He had done the State some service by his writings upon the American rebellion, and Lord Dartmouth was entrusted with the task of ascertaining if any new preferment would suit his wishes. Fletcher replied "I want nothing but more grace." As might be expected, so simple-minded a man was peculiarly happy in his dealings with children. Many stories are told of him in this connexion. Let one suffice by way of illustration. He was trying one day to persuade a number of them in his parish to pay attention to the service in which they were engaged, and to be sure to remember the text he was about to announce. A robin flew into the house and every child instantly and instinctively watched the bird instead of the preacher. "Now," said he, "I see you can attend to that robin. Well, I will take that robin for my text," and preached on the habits of the bird and the providential care of the Creator.

Wesley found in him the fullest realisation of what he meant by Christian perfection, and his noble funeral sermon on the vicar of Madeley, from the suggestive text, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace," is the strongest and most unqualified eulogy he ever uttered; far stronger even than that which he made in his funeral sermon on his old friend George Whitefield. Others were quite as enthusiastic about the excellence of Fletcher as Wesley was. Dr. Benson, the headmaster of the School or Training College for ministers which Lady

Huntingdon founded at Trevecca, and of which Fletcher was Visitor, writes: "He was revered, he was loved, he was almost adored. My heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so." Henry Venn said to one who asked him his opinion of Fletcher, "Sir, he was a luminary—a luminary, did I say?—he was a sun! I have known all the great men for these fifty years, but none like him!" Fletcher was thoroughly worthy of all this admiration, for a more Christ-like man never lived. And it is said that Voltaire, when challenged to produce a character as perfect as that of our Lord, at once mentioned Fletcher of Madeley.

Another still more prominent leader in the early days of the Evangelical revival was Selina, Countess of Huntingdon (1707-1791), whose sole purpose in life was to bring about a revival of religion among the upper classes. To this she devoted all her energies, time, money, and sacrificed her social reputation. The contempt and ridicule of her own order did not in the least discourage her, and ultimately she was treated with the respect she richly deserved. She drew together the *élite* of the fashionable world to hear her favourite preachers, either in her drawing-room at Chelsea, or her chapel at Bath, or at the Tabernacle itself, where Whitefield preached. Even some of the bishops went incognito in Bath, where curtained seats were placed immediately inside the door of the chapel into which the prelates were smuggled, the space being termed by the wit of the day "Nicodemus's corner." She made a successful personal petition to King George III. and the Queen against the gaiety of the household of Archbishop Cornwallis, and so impressed the King, that he said to one prelate who complained of the conduct of some of her students and ministers, "I wish there was a Lady Huntingdon in every diocese in the kingdom." She either built or bought chapels "in various parts of the kingdom, in which she appointed such persons to officiate as ministers as she thought fit, revoking such appointments at her pleasure." They were known as "Lady Huntingdon's Connexion," and many still remain, though under changed designations, as, for example, Surrey Chapel, now Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road. In

Countess of Huntingdon.

these the Church Service was used, and the officiating minister wore the customary vesture. She availed herself to the full of her privilege of appointing chaplains, and most of the leading Evangelical clergy served in this capacity. Altogether, she is said to have spent something like £100,000 in the service of religion, itself no mean test of genuineness.

The congregations, however, tended to separate themselves from the normal connexion with the National Church. A discussion in the Consistorial Court of London about the status of the chapel in Spa Fields brought the matter to a crisis and rendered it necessary to clearly define her position. If her chapels were still to be regarded as belonging to the Church, then the laws of the Church must be obeyed. If not, and they were to be sheltered under the Toleration Act, they must be registered as dissenting places of worship. And so against her will she found herself a dissenter. She thus commented upon the position: "All the other connexions seem to be at peace, and I have ever found to belong to me [the English is her own and characteristic] while we were at ease in Zion. I am to be cast out of the Church now, only for what I have been doing these forty years—speaking and living for Jesus Christ; and if the days of my captivity are now to be accomplished, those that turn me out, and so set me at liberty, may soon feel what it is, by sore distress themselves for these hard services they have caused me." It is anticipating somewhat, but it should here be noted that after this "secession," by means of which she hoped to find a position somewhere midway between Church and dissent, those parochial clergymen, such as Romaine, Venn, and others, who had given her their gratuitous services, withdrew from the Connexion, though not from her friendship.

In both cases, that of John Wesley and that of the Countess of Huntingdon, the final severance is deeply to be lamented, especially in the light of the events of the succeeding century. But it is equally true that, humanly speaking, there was no help for it. They were neither of them easy to work with. They were both of them unconventional in their methods and regardless of consequences. They did not understand the governmental policy of an episcopal Church. We cannot imagine John Wesley as a territorial bishop, or

even as a provincial archbishop. He would have been carrying his crosier into his brethren's provinces and generally rendering diocesan (as he did parochial) government and unity impossible. And the days were not yet when even a Countess of Huntingdon could be allowed to usurp some of the episcopal functions, such as the appointment of ministers and the cancelling of such appointments at her sole will or whim. Perhaps if Convocation had been sitting some *modus vivendi* might have been found. As it was, exaggerated individualism on both sides brought with it its customary Nemesis.

AUTHORITIES.—In addition to the authorities at the end of the last chapter may be noted *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, article "Fletcher of Madeley" and authorities cited therein. Fletcher's *Works*, 8 vols., 1836, should be consulted especially for his correspondence. *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, by a member of the Houses of Shirley and Hastings, 2 vols. 1839, is full and accurate. Mr. Quiller-Couch has given in his *Hetty Wesley* a living picture of the time and of the characters of the Wesley family. The best *Life* of George Whitefield is that by the Rev. J. P. Gledstone. Some striking extracts from the Walker-Wesley correspondence will be found in an able article in the *Saturday Review* for March 28, 1891, of which Canon Overton thought so highly that he wished to thank the author for it. But the author, the Rev. Thomas Hancock, a high authority on the whole period, was dead before it was discovered who had written the article, and then Overton was gone also. Details of the Yatton epileptic will be found in the *Encycl. Brit.*, sixth edition, article "Possession."

CHAPTER VII

POTTER, GIBSON, AND SHERLOCK

The condition of things described at the end of the last chapter affords ample illustration of the harm which had been done to the Church by the silencing of Convocation, for then surely was the time when synodal action was needed. More than twenty years had elapsed since Convocation had met, and there is not the slightest ground for believing that the temporary disputes, by no means of so serious a character as is often represented, which led to that arbitrary proceeding would have continued to interfere with its harmonious action. As it was, both the bishops and the clergy were placed in a most embarrassing position. They had to deal, each on his own personal responsibility, with a problem which had never before presented itself in a similar form to the Church. In the whole range of Church history there had never been any question requiring to be settled precisely like that raised by the early Methodists. The closest parallel to be found is that of the action of the Friars, who invaded parishes, heard confessions, and were not subject to episcopal authority and jurisdiction. And the Methodist question was totally different from that raised by the Puritans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Then, an alteration in the Church's doctrine and discipline or formularies, or all three, was loudly called for. The Puritans, even the most moderate of them, were dissatisfied, more or less, with the Church and Constitution. But there was nothing of this kind in the case of the early Methodists. Of their great leader (for, after all, in spite

The Methodists and the Church.

of the temporary prominence of George Whitefield and the many merits of others, John Wesley was the real life and soul of the whole movement) it was said by Alexander Knox, who knew him perhaps better than any man did, or at any rate could judge of him impartially because he viewed him *ab extra*, "He was a Church of England man even in circumstantials. There was not a service or a ceremony, a gesture or a habit, for which he had not an unfeigned predilection."

John Wesley himself perceived, and on more than one occasion dwelt with pride on this marked distinction between his work and previous movements. In a striking sermon which he preached on laying the foundation-stone of the City Road Chapel, he specially drew attention to "one circumstance attending the present revival of religion which," he says, "I apprehend is quite peculiar to it. It cannot be denied that there have been several considerable revivals of religion in England since the Reformation. But the generality of the English nation were little profited thereby, because they that were the subjects of those revivals, preachers as well as people, soon separated from the Established Church, and formed themselves into a distinct sect. So did the Presbyterians first; afterwards the Independents, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers; and after this was done they did scarce any good, except to their own little body. . . . But it is not so in the present revival of religion. The Methodists (so termed) know their own calling. Their first purpose is, let the clergy or laity use them well or ill, by the grace of God, to endure all things, to hold on their even course, and to continue in the Church, maugre men or devils, unless God permits them to be thrust out." And in his still more striking sermon on the ministerial office, preached only two years before his death, he thus apostrophises his followers: "Ye are a new phenomenon in the earth—a body of people who, being of no sect or party, are friends to all parties, and endeavour to forward all in heart-religion, in the knowledge and love of God and man. Ye yourselves were at first called in the Church of England; and though ye have and will have a thousand temptations to leave it, and set up for yourselves, regard them not; be Church of England men still; do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you,

John Wesley's position.

and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God hath raised you up."

As for Deists, Socinians, Arians, or even Latitudinarians, within the Church, the Methodists stood on a totally different footing from any of these. They asked for no relaxation of subscription, as even some Church dignitaries did; no exemption from oaths, as on one side the Quakers, on another side the Non-Jurors, did. They were perfectly content that everything should stand just as it was. They were not led by ignorant fanatics, but by Oxford graduates, two of them being men of high university standing, on the foundation of their respective colleges. Their practices, as the better instructed among churchmen well knew, were not forbidden by any rule of the Catholic Church. Field-preaching, lay-preaching, class meetings, watch-night services, and the rest might be irregular, but they were not unlawful on any true Church principles. "Irregular" was, indeed, the general epithet applied to them, and that not accurately, for what definite rule did they break? "Insubordinate" would have been a more correct term; but how in the world were they to be brought into subordination?

The bishops have been seriously blamed by some for their action, by others for their inaction. But when we go to the fountain-head, that is, to John Wesley's own writings, a different impression is conveyed. He has many kind words, and few, if any, unkind ones for his ecclesiastical superiors.

The bishops and John Wesley.

"No one," he says, "ever thought or called Methodism leaving the Church. It was never esteemed so by Archbishop Potter, with whom I had the happiness of conversing freely; nor by Archbishop Secker, who was thoroughly acquainted with every step we took; as was likewise Dr. Gibson, then Bishop of London; and that great man, Bishop Lowth. Nor did any of these venerable men ever blame me for it in all the conversations I had with them. Only Archbishop Potter once said, 'Those gentlemen are irregular; but they have done good, and I pray God to bless them.'" The severest rebuke which he ever received in his interviews with bishops was administered by the greatest of all the bishops of the day. Bishop Butler closed an interview by saying, "Mr. Wesley, I will deal plainly with

you: I once thought you and Mr. Whitefield well-meaning men, but I cannot think so now, for I have heard more of you—matters of fact, sir. And Mr. Whitefield says in his journal, 'There are promises still to be fulfilled in me.' Sir, the pretending to extraordinary revelation and gifts of the Holy Ghost is a horrid thing, a very horrid thing."

What does seem strange is that neither the bishops nor the clergy made any sort of attempt at united action. At any rate, we should have thought that the bishops might have met informally to consult together as to what they should do. Such meetings were not unknown then any more than they are at present. They had frequently taken place during the crises of the Revolution in 1688-89. But nothing of the kind appears even to have been thought of fifty years later, when the new phenomenon of Methodism faced the bishops and urgently required to be dealt with in some way or other, though there is evidence that they met in 1749 to discuss the Moravian Bill then in the House of Lords, as will be seen in a later chapter. In the case of Methodism each individual bishop and each individual clergyman seem to have done what was right in their own eyes, and the consequences, from whatever standpoint we regard them, were disastrous. The blame rested more with the system, or rather strange lack of system, than with individuals. But these points will be best illustrated by a survey of the careers and characters of some of the leading prelates with whom the Methodists were brought into contact.

In the early years of the Methodist movement John Potter was Archbishop of Canterbury, and Lancelot Blackburne Archbishop of York, the latter being very soon, in 1743, succeeded by Thomas Herring (1693-1757). Herring was only four years Archbishop of York, and was then translated to Canterbury, but he left his mark very deeply cut on the diocese of York. The four folio volumes which contain the record of his primary Visitation are a witness to the care with which he entered into all the details of the parochial life in the diocese, and also to the very large amount of quiet spiritual life and work that prevailed in it, an amount that would not be credited by those who look upon the Church of that time as wholly, or almost

Thomas Herring.

wholly, asleep. Research into other similar diocesan records would, probably, evince the same result, and the task is one which still requires to be undertaken before a final verdict on the general Church life of the time can be formulated. During his four years at York he was in the habit of making long journeys round his diocese, thus gaining for himself a knowledge which could be got only by personal inspection. It was while there, too, so full were the years of work and life, that he led the movement against the Jacobite invasion. He called together the leading men of the county and appealed for funds to oppose the enemy, raising £40,000 by his enthusiasm and zeal, besides setting the example to the whole nation.

John Potter.

There was some little surprise generally, and not a little disappointment on the part of individuals, when, on the death of Archbishop Wake in 1737, John Potter (1674-1747) was appointed his successor. But Potter did not reach the primacy *per saltum*. He had gone through all the stages which in those days were thought, and not altogether wrongly thought, to be qualifications for the highest offices in the Church. It was distinctly to his credit, though, as we shall see presently, it may have been a drawback to his success, that he rose through his own merits, without any adventitious aids. He was the son of a linen-draper at Wakefield, and received his education at the excellent grammar-school of his native town, until he went, at the age of fourteen, in the humble capacity of a servitor, to University College, Oxford. In 1694 he was elected to a fellowship at Lincoln, which at that time could boast of several distinguished fellows, among whom Potter could certainly be reckoned. He made his mark both as a scholar and theologian. When he was only twenty years of age he published a work of considerable merit, and this was followed by others, notably *The Antiquities of Greece*, which had the honour of being incorporated, with a lofty compliment to the author, by Gronovius in his *Thesaurus*. But it is more to the present purpose to dwell upon his theological writings, which were not only valuable in themselves but peculiarly seasonable, because they dwelt upon points which were far too little noticed in the time of the Georges. Potter's *Discourse of*

Church Government was for many years as much a text-book in theology as his *Antiquities of Greece* was in classics. It brings out into strong relief the spiritual nature and independence of the Church, the author contending that the ecclesiastical was distinct from the spiritual authority, and that episcopacy was of Divine institution. It thus afforded the necessary antidote to the Erastian and Latitudinarian views of the day; while his careful edition of the works of Clement of Alexandria drew attention to the far too much neglected study of the early Fathers.

He held several country cures in his early ministerial life, but it is to be feared that this does not imply that he therefore possessed that very important qualification for a bishop in the present day—practical experience of parochial work; for systematic parochial work was an exception in the eighteenth century, and from what can be gathered Potter did not come under the exception; since, as he held two or three livings at the same time, he must have been non-resident in some, and for a large portion of that time he had other occupations which hindered his frequent residence in any. For three years, from 1704 to 1707, he was domestic chaplain to Archbishop Tenison, which necessitated his residence at Lambeth, and in 1707 he became Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Canon of Christ Church, and was therefore obliged to spend much time at Oxford. Then he became Bishop of Oxford in 1715, retaining his professorship and at least one of his livings, Newington, in Oxfordshire, along with his bishopric, and he held that see for twelve years. His appointment to the professorship placed him in a rather invidious position, for his predecessor, Dr. Jane, had been unable to fulfil the duties of the chair for six years before his death, and they had been performed very satisfactorily by a deputy, Dr. Smalridge, who was a more distinguished and more popular man than Potter; but Potter was promoted.

He became one of the many clerical *protégés* of Queen Caroline, who had a predilection for learned men, whatever their opinions might be, and it was at her instance that, six months before her death, he was made Archbishop of Canterbury, holding the primacy till his death in 1747. It was his curious fate twice in his life to be appointed to a great office

instead of the obvious man, the man whom every one expected, the man who had actually been doing the work for many years. As it was at Oxford in 1707, so it was at Canterbury in 1737. For six years Bishop Gibson had virtually been primate, owing to Wake's growing infirmities. So sure was every one that he would succeed as a matter of course when the expected vacancy occurred, that he was commonly called "the heir-apparent to Canterbury." But Archbishop Wake died, and to the surprise of all Bishop Potter, not Bishop Gibson, was his successor. Walpole supported Hare, Bishop of Chichester, but Potter had the stronger support of Lord Hervey. "Sure, sir," said he to Walpole, "you have had enough of great geniuses: why can you not take some Greek and Hebrew blockhead, that has learning enough to justify the preferment, and not sense enough to make you repent of it?" If contemporary gossip is to be trusted, the archbishop was rather intoxicated by his unexpected elevation. He is said to have been ostentatious and too much of a courtier, even for those days of courtier-prelates. "When," says Whiston, "he became Archbishop, not only did he assume a high and pontifical state—having, for instance, half-a-dozen bare-headed footmen by the side of his coach—but also became a courtier in his own ways, and fond of gross flattery from others." He had well earned his promotion. But because of his invidious position, because he was promoted over the heads of one if not two who had clearly prior claims to the archbishopric, he was sure to be severely criticised. And those who rise from a low to a high estate often, without meaning it, give offence by acting as "men to the manner born" would not act, to say nothing of the jealousy which success was sure to awaken.

Potter's primacy.

Be this as it may, Dr. Potter seems to have done very good service to the Church in more ways than one. In the first place, he helped to break down that mischievous notion which was only too common in the eighteenth century, that a High churchman must be a Tory, and a Latitudinarian a Whig. The two parties, which had arisen in the reign of William III. divided the Church as well as the State, and the divisions were practically the same. The Tory, who

was also a High churchman, upheld the doctrines of indefeasible hereditary right, of unlimited non-resistance, and of ecclesiastical authority as inherent in the Church and State. The Whig, who was also a Low churchman or a Latitudinarian, thought but little of these things. He dreaded popery and loved the principles of the Revolution which had freed the country from its fear of Romanism. He would have gone further, and by increasing the freedom of the Church from the authority of the bishops might even have endangered the safety of the Protestant establishment itself. But notwithstanding the support which Potter gave to High Church principles, he seems to have been regarded as a staunch Whig. Hearne, in his *Remarks and Collections*, says of him: "At length being noted for a person of Whiggish principles, he was taken notice of by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Tennison I mean, who has no regard for Learning or Learned Men. . . . I say, Mr. Potter being taken notice of by this Archbishop he was made one of his Domestick Chaplains . . . and a little after had a Parsonage given him by His Grace, purely to incourage him to go on in the Sneaking way, which accordingly Mr. Potter does, and may do the Archbishop some service by it."

Potter's politics.

Hearne had a special abhorrence of him as the *protégé* of "the loggerhead at Lambeth," as he calls Archbishop Tenison. But Potter was a better churchman than Lord Bolingbroke and many others who were so called. Potter's views on Church government and the early Fathers have already been noticed, and his charges, though tinged with the pessimism which in those days had become rather a popular mode of thought with no very definite meaning behind it, indicate his decided churchmanship. It was not of the kind to create enthusiasm or to make a very strong impression, but it was definite and consistent. He was a good specimen of the prelates of his day, learned, scholarly, and eminently respectable, but rather slow and not inspiring. As Bishop of Oxford he ordained John Wesley both deacon and priest, always spoke kindly of him, and had interviews with him after he had become Archbishop of Canterbury; at one of these the archbishop gave Wesley advice which made the deepest impression upon

him. One of Wesley's later sermons urging attendance on the Church Service concludes with the words:—"Near fifty years ago a great and good man, Dr. Potter, then Archbishop of Canterbury, gave me an advice for which I have ever since had occasion to bless God—'If you desire to be extensively useful, do not spend your time and strength in contending for or against such things as are of a disputable nature, but in testifying against open, notorious vice, and in promoting real essential holiness.'" Those who have studied the mind of John Wesley know how carefully he attended to this advice. He shrank from controversy whenever he could possibly avoid it. He made light—too light—of differences of opinion. He would join with any one who, in his opinion, was ready to promote holiness. Potter's own conduct suggests that he would perhaps have been rather dismayed to learn how literally Wesley took his words, but they were seasonable at the time when controversy was rife and practical religion at a very low ebb.

Potter and Wesley.

Potter gave an example of the prevailing nepotism of the times which still passed almost uncensured. His son-in-law, Jeremiah Miller, benefited by his marriage even beyond most of his kind. Nichols says of him: "His Grace obtained for him from the Crown the united rectories of St. Edmund the King and St. Nicholas Axon in Lombard Street, with that of Merstham, Surrey, and the sinecure of West Tarring in Sussex. From the chantorship of Exeter he was promoted to the deanery of that Cathedral. All these preferments he held till his death, except that of West Tarring, which he resigned a few years before, to his son." Of Potter's relation with the Moravians we shall see something in a later chapter.

His nepotism.

Of the other primate, Lancelot Blackburne (1658-1743), Archbishop of York, little need be said except to caution the reader against accepting too implicitly the gossiping stories which are told against him. It should always be remembered that at that time the clergy in general, and the bishops in particular, were very unpopular. People greedily swallowed any tale that could be told against them, and the demand met with an abundant supply. There were numerous people who were only too

Lancelot Blackburne.

ready to tell such tales, and, worse still, to print them; and, the worst of all, later writers have been far too ready to quote them as if they were grave history. There was only too good reason for this unpopularity. Pluralities, as we shall see over and over again, were common, especially among the higher clergy, and with the pluralities came the inevitable scandal of non-residence. Neglect of duty necessarily followed. The bishops and clergy were engaged in almost everything except their proper work. That they either neglected or handed it over to ill-paid and illiterate curates. The scandals were not few in number nor concealed from public view, and the public judged the Church by what it saw and heard. Blackburne was described by Horace Walpole as "the jolly old archbishop, who, though he had been a buccaneer, had all the manners of a man of quality, and retained nothing of his old profession except his seraglio." There is no foundation for Walpole's remark about the seraglio. It is one of his many careless slanders. The archbishop had in early life been a chaplain in one of the many buccaneering expeditions against the Spaniards, and the easy-going habits and manners of the sailor life never left him. At a Confirmation at Nottingham, for example, after the service was over he ordered pipes and liquor into the vestry, though it should be added that the vicar of the parish interrupted the servant and ordered that the smoking-party should meet elsewhere.

The real power in the Church at this time, however, was not in the hands of either of the primates, but in those of the Bishop of London. Edmund Gibson (1669-1748), so far as his outer life was concerned, bore a curious resemblance to John Potter. He was also very much of the same type of character, though the difference between them was all in Gibson's favour. Although he was of gentle birth, he must, like Potter, have felt the need of economy in youth, for after having been educated at the grammar school at Bampton in Westmoreland, near his home at Knipe, he went up as a "poor child," "a poor serving child," to Queen's College, Oxford, where, however, he was soon elected a taberdar, and in due time a fellow. Like Potter, he appeared very early in print, for just at the time when he was taking his B.A. degree he published an edition

Edmund Gibson.

of the *Chronicon Saxonicum*, with a Latin translation, notes, a preface, and a chronological index. And like Potter he became a favourite of Archbishop Tenison, who made him his domestic chaplain and librarian of Lambeth, and afterwards, through the archbishop's interest, he became Precentor and Canon Residentiary at Chichester, Rector of Lambeth, and Archdeacon of Surrey. Hence he became, like Potter again, an object of special abhorrence to Hearne, who depreciates both his character and his writings, especially the latter. But, as he did not live on the spot, he did not exasperate the amusing Oxford diarist quite so much as Potter did, and is therefore not so frequently girded at. He became one of the most voluminous writers of the period, and some of his works are of considerable value. He was an industrious and sensible, rather than a brilliant or original writer on an extraordinary variety of subjects, as the titles of his works show. They include *Historia Bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxonii; Vita Thomae Bodleii;* English translation of Camden's *Britannia; Reliquiae Spelmanniae; Family Devotions; Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani; The Holy Communion explained; De Excommunicatione; Charges; Digest of the Principal Treatises against Popery; An Earnest Dissuasive from Intemperance; Pastoral Letter for Reformation of Life.*

The *Codex* is the most important and valuable of his works, and he was, either in recognition of its value or because it indicated the plodding nature of his mind, nicknamed "Dr. Codex." His literary researches did not interfere with his work as a clergyman; and when Dr. Wake was advanced to Canterbury, he recommended Gibson, his former ally in the Convocation controversy, as the most fitting person to succeed him at Lincoln. Gibson accordingly became Bishop of Lincoln in 1717, and held that see until 1723, when, on the death of Dr. Robinson, he was translated to London, and retained that most responsible post until his death in 1748. For a quarter of a century Bishop Gibson was for all practical purposes by far the first and most influential of all the prelates in England. By some means he acquired the entire confidence of Sir Robert Walpole, and it was to the credit of Walpole, whose Church policy was otherwise generally disastrous, that he allowed himself to be guided

by Bishop Gibson. "When he was reproached with allowing Gibson to be a sort of Pope, he replied, 'And a very good Pope too.'" Perhaps it was one of the secrets of Gibson's influence that he had no fear of offending his patron; indeed, on one occasion when, in 1736, Walpole had set his mind on passing the Quakers' Relief Bill, Gibson threw his whole weight on the other side; and this opposition, though it cost him the primacy, did not lose him his power, which he retained, after the fall of Walpole, under his feebler successors. No one man was strong enough to stem the tide of irreligion and immorality, and certainly not a man of the rather jog-trot type of Gibson. But he did his very best, steadily setting his face against vice in all forms, and not hesitating to reproach the King because he encouraged masquerades, which were a most fertile source of evil; and speaking out, without fear or favour, in pastorals, letters, charges, pamphlets, and sermons. Indeed, his zeal is said to have been rather inconvenient (in its modern sense of embarrassing, or awkward), and for that reason an attempt was made to close his mouth by the offer of the rich see of Winchester.

He certainly ought to have had the offer of the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1737, when, as we have seen, he had been virtually primate for six years. He does not appear to have resented the marked neglect, which almost amounted to an affront, and it did not interfere with his power, for in practical matters he was a far stronger man than Archbishop Potter. On the death of Potter in 1747, the primacy was offered to Gibson. But it was then too late. He was a very old man, with all the infirmities of old age creeping upon him, and in the following year, 1748, he died. His mind was very much of the type of Potter's—cultured, reasonable, cautious, but without any of the fire of genius and without any of those capacities for awakening enthusiasm which John Wesley possessed in an eminent degree. In his views he was perhaps less of a churchman and less of a Whig than Potter. Patristic studies, which attracted Potter, had no attraction for Gibson; and instead of interesting himself, as Potter did, in the theory of Church government, he devoted himself to "governing the Church"; and it may be added that he was quite as successful in the one line as

Potter was in the other. Like Potter, again, he was frequently brought into contact with the Wesleys, and both John and Charles Wesley speak of Gibson as a friend rather than as an enemy, though he had no sympathy whatever with what he would regard as their "enthusiasm."

Thomas Sherlock.

Thomas Sherlock (1678-1761), who succeeded Gibson in the see of London, was another thoroughly representative type of the eighteenth-century prelate. He was a man of a much more powerful and original mind than either Potter or Gibson. In fact, as the reader of an earlier chapter will have gathered, he was in the front rank of those who made the early Georgian era a period in which the Church, from one point of view, showed itself at its strongest; from another, perhaps, the weakest, in its whole history, that is, in the defence of its position from the intellectual side. The talents of Thomas Sherlock were hereditary, his father, William Sherlock, Dean of St. Paul's, having been one of the ablest men of his day, though his abilities were somewhat discounted from the fact that they were employed one year in writing one of the most convincing pamphlets that ever appeared in favour of the Non-Jurors, and in the very next year an equally able pamphlet against them, the writer in the interval having executed a rapid and complete change of front. It was remembered against his son, who, as we shall see, was suspected, though most unjustly, of a tendency towards time-serving. There is really no inconsistency in Thomas Sherlock's attitude from first to last, but his clear, lawyer-like, logical intellect prevented him from being as narrow-minded as some of his contemporaries were. He looked with a much more favourable eye than they did upon the Non-Jurors. He himself had no difficulty about taking the oaths to George I.; but he not only respected the conscientiousness and self-sacrifice of those who could not, but perceived, as with his luminous mind he could not fail to do, that their position was far more logical than that of those (a more numerous party) who swallowed the oaths but were favourable to the restoration of the Stewarts.

Of one very distinguished Non-Juror, William Law, he appears to have been a personal friend, and is said to have offered to advance his interests if he would comply. Law

certainly valued him very highly, and breaking his rule of never entering into personalities, either for praise or blame (especially blame), wrote in terms of very warm commendation of Sherlock. He said that the name of Sherlock "was justly venerable to much the greater and most worthy part of the whole English Church," and that his "life had been manifestly serviceable in the most trying times, to the good of this part of the Christian Church." Sherlock was blamed for not being vigorous enough against the Non-Jurors at Cambridge after the Rebellion of 1715, that is, in plain words, of not persecuting them sufficiently; and so he was suspected of wavering, like his father, which he never did. Again, though he was a determined opponent of Deism, he could not help seeing that there was an element of truth in the contention of the greatest of the Deists, that Christianity was as old as the creation and was a republication of the religion of nature, for which admission he was absurdly suspected of being half a Deist himself. And finally, his discriminating estimate of Methodism did not at all suit those who were for destroying it root and branch. He could hardly be called a Methodist himself, as his successor, Bishop Porteus was, but he was thought to be too weak to oppose the movement.

His hereditary talents were cultivated by his education and early ministerial life. From Eton—where he numbered among his friends boys who afterwards became the leading statesmen of the day, Robert Walpole, Henry Pelham, and Lord Townshend—he proceeded to St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, a small society in which it might have been expected that he would not find much competition to sharpen his talents. But there was one man (or, as he would then be called, "lad,") who was fully able to keep him on the alert. It was when they were both undergraduates together at St. Catherine's that the rivalry began between Benjamin Hoadly and Thomas Sherlock, which afterwards showed itself in the Bangorian Controversy. Later still, at Queen Caroline's philosophical tea-parties, and, in fact, all through the lives of both, the two were not unfairly matched. Both of them possessed the keenest of keen intellects; both were ambitious; and both of them were born combatants.

Education.

Sherlock took his degree with high honours in 1697, and was elected fellow of his College in 1698, Hoadly being one of the electors. He continued to reside at Cambridge, and soon became one of the most prominent men during a singularly brilliant but also a singularly turbulent period in its history, the time of Bentley, Waterland, and Colbatch. But his university life hardly bears upon our subject.

In 1704, at the early age of twenty-six, he became Master of the Temple, in succession to his father, who resigned and used his influence on behalf of his son, "by the King's order." The Queen is commonly credited with the appointment. The lawyers were not a little dismayed and disgusted at being put under the spiritual guidance of so young a man. But they soon learned to appreciate him, and Sherlock grew deeply attached to his office. It was a post for which he was eminently qualified. His sermons are exactly those which especially suited that most critical of all congregations, a congregation of lawyers. They are clear, sensible, well thought out, and well expressed, not over long, with no particular ornament of style, no fine writing, very few illustrations, argumentative but not combative. Thomas Gray, the poet, an excellent and very fastidious judge, said that Bishop Sherlock had given some specimens of pulpit excellence which were unparalleled in their kind. We can fancy that he would never feel more at home than in the pulpit of the Temple, where he was sure of carrying his audience with him. It was the last duty he would neglect, and the office was the last he would give up. In 1714 he was elected Master of his college. He was Vice-Chancellor of the University during the critical period of the Rebellion of 1715, in which capacity he had to return thanks to the new King for the magnificent present of books, the whole of Bishop Moore's library, valued at £6000—in recognition of its loyalty as distinguished from the disloyalty of the sister university.

At the Temple.

It was also the period of the great Bentley dispute, when Bentley made his furious and unmerciful attack upon the Deist Collins, an account of which has already appeared in Chapter III., and threw not only the university but the country into a state of feverish excitement. It was therefore

a most trying time for a man in a position of the highest responsibility. But Sherlock was just the man to come well out of such a trial. His intellectual powers generally enabled him to hold his own among the singularly brilliant men who were then in residence, and his legal mind enabled him to discriminate between what was judicious and what was not, and prevented him from making mistakes. In short, he was so commanding a figure in the university that he was nicknamed by Bentley "Cardinal Alberoni."

And yet his attention must have been greatly diverted by other matters. For in 1715 he became Dean of Chichester, and along with the deanery held his two other preferments until 1719. Then in 1717 arose the Bangorian Controversy, in which he was almost in honour bound to take a part, because he had been chairman of the committee of the Lower House of Convocation which had drawn up an able *Representation* against Hoadly's views. The work also was thoroughly congenial to him, for he never missed an opportunity of measuring swords with Hoadly, while Hoadly equally enjoyed measuring swords with Sherlock. So the contest went on merrily on both sides. In 1727 he was made Bishop of Bangor, and became a very effective speaker in the House of Lords on Walpole's side. But amidst all his various avocations he did not neglect the practical work of his diocese, as his predecessor Hoadly had done in the same post. In 1734 he was translated from Bangor to Salisbury, again succeeding his old antagonist Hoadly.

Bishop of Bangor.

On the death of Archbishop Potter in 1748, he declined the primacy on the ground of ill-health; but in 1749 he accepted the see of London, perhaps a still more arduous post, rendered all the more arduous by the activity of his predecessor, Gibson. He was then more than seventy years of age, and partly through his growing infirmities, partly perhaps because such work was not so much in his line, he was not so active as Gibson, though he was not neglectful of his duties. Probably there never was so strong an appeal issued as that of Bishop Sherlock on the occasion of the famous earthquake shocks, which caused an unprecedented panic in London in the spring of 1750. It

London.

was written with all that command of language and power of reasoning in which Sherlock was unrivalled. It took the gloomiest views of the immorality and irreligion of the great city, as if it had almost sunk to the level of the cities of the plain and might expect a like doom. The bishop spared no class, hitting at once the highest and the lowest, the governors and the governed; the appeal, which came at a moment of extraordinary panic, met with an unprecedentedly rapid and extensive circulation, though it is questionable whether it was not the childish panic rather than the awakened sense of sin that was the secret of its success. It may be observed that the bishop took notice of the fact that the alarm occurred during the season of Lent, and that it was an aggravation of public iniquity that pleasure, guilty pleasure as well as innocent, went on during that season of humiliation as much as at other times. He followed it by another tract, urging the better observance of Good Friday, which should not have been without effect. Sherlock only published one charge to the diocese of London, delivered in the year 1759, when his health had completely broken down. The subject of it is, the obligation of incumbents to reside upon their cures, and it is a remarkable illustration of the lax views that prevailed, that the enforcement of truths which now appear so obvious that they may almost be called truisms, such as that a man cannot properly perform his duties if he is not on the spot, should have given great offence, and produced the now most unusual phenomenon of clergymen answering a bishop's charge.

AUTHORITIES.—The *Works* of Archbishop Potter, 1753; Hearne's *Remarks and Collections*, most fully, though as yet only partly, edited in the publications of the Oxford Historical Society; meanwhile the extracts by Bliss, 1837, in 3 vols., are convenient and useful; the *Charges* of Bishop Edmund Gibson and his *Works* generally; the *Works* of Thomas Sherlock, 4 vols., 1812; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, on Blackburne, Gibson, Sherlock, and Herring; *Some Account of Bishop Gibson*, by Richard Smalbroke, 1749. Nichol's *Literary Anecdotes* give the gossip of the time, but are to be read *cum grano*.

CHAPTER VIII

BENSON, BUTLER, AND SECKER

THE three names of Potter, Gibson, and Sherlock are naturally associated together, but still more closely are those of another trio, whose lives were so interwoven that it is difficult to treat them separately. These three are Martin Benson (1689-1752), Joseph Butler (1692-1752), and Thomas Secker (1693-1768). All three furnish interesting illustrations of Church life in the eighteenth century, though in fairness it must be owned less than the three previously noticed. Are they to be taken as specimens of the ordinary prelate of the period? They rank much above the average, but the difference is one of degree rather than of kind. They were essentially eighteenth-century men, but the faults of the age were less, and its merits (for it had merits) more conspicuous in them than in the majority.

Martin Benson.

Martin Benson (1689-1752), the eldest of the three, was one of those few men about whose characters there seems to have been but one opinion. There is not a jarring note in the chorus of praise with which writers from all quarters greet his name. This is very unusual in the case of an English prelate of the Georgian era; for among the faults of the age an extravagant and indiscriminate admiration of its bishops cannot be reckoned. There are few indeed about whom the annalists, diarists, and gossip-mongers in general have not some extremely disagreeable remarks to make. But among those few is Martin Benson. It is true that his course of life did not lay him open to censure. If he had an enemy, he did not fulfil the aspiration of the patriarch, "Oh . . . that mine adversary had written a book!"

for with the exception of a few single sermons of the usual eighteenth-century type, steering warily between Rome and Geneva, he published nothing. He did not mix himself up in matters outside his proper province, nor even in the general affairs of the Church, and contented himself with doing his duty quietly but energetically in the special sphere in which he moved. He was certainly not a pushing preferment-hunter; indeed, as we shall see, far from it. Still, he was not obscure, and his actions gave ample room for adverse criticism if they had been at all open to it, which they obviously were not.

Bishop Benson's universal popularity may have been partly due to the fact that from his earliest years he had been trained in the way best calculated to fit him for the position to which he attained. He was not, as some other bishops were, lifted out of his natural sphere. Like the Wesleys, he spent his childhood in a country rectory, his father being Rector of Cradley in Herefordshire, a fairly good living, though not so wealthy as to place his family in the lap of luxury. From thence, like John Wesley, he passed to Charterhouse, then, as now, one of our leading public schools; and from thence, again like John Wesley, to Christ Church, then by far the most distinguished college at Oxford; where he was, like Charles Wesley, on the foundation of the House, and became a college tutor. In this capacity he came into intimate relationship with young men belonging to the most prominent families in the kingdom; among others with Lord Huntingdon, who afterwards married "the saintly Selina," and this first brought Benson in after days into contact with the Evangelical revival. The Countess of Huntingdon turned Methodist, to the dismay of her friends, who asked her husband to interfere. Huntingdon could think of nothing better than to call in the aid of his old Oxford tutor, and an interview took place between Benson and Lady Huntingdon which did not have the desired effect. Indeed, from what we know of Bishop Benson, that would not be likely, for he would sympathise to a very great extent with her change, being essentially a "serious" man.

With the Oxford days the resemblance to the Wesleys ceases. Instead of flying off at a tangent, Benson, after spend-

ing some little time on the Continent, settled quietly down as a clergyman, became in 1721 Archdeacon of Berks, in 1724 Prebendary of Durham, in 1726 Chaplain to the Prince of Wales (soon to become King George II.), in 1727 Rector of Bletchley, and finally, in 1735, Bishop of Gloucester. Gloucester was a poor bishopric, but when Benson was appointed he determined never to accept any higher preferment. He never did, and apparently never sought for it. It is said that he owed his advancement to the desire on the part of the Bishop of London to make amends to the Lord Chancellor Talbot, Benson's friend and patron, who was deeply hurt by the successful opposition raised by Richard Venn, father of Henry Venn, on the ground of heresy, to the appointment of Dr. Rundle, whom Talbot had nominated to the see to which Benson was raised. But there was no need to account for Benson's promotion on any other ground than his own merits. It was no sudden rise for him. He had gone through all the previous stages; it was the most natural thing in the world for him to become a bishop, and a most excellent bishop he made. He gave himself entirely to the work of his diocese for seventeen years. He revived, at least locally, the office of Rural Dean. He spent large sums and gave much attention to the improvement of the fabric of the cathedral and the repair of the episcopal palace. As is proved by his treatment of Whitefield, whom he ordained at Gloucester in 1736, he took a deep interest in his clergy, and was liberal in his help to the poor amongst them. His chief friends were among the best men of the day, notably George Berkeley, Joseph Butler, and Thomas Secker. There was a dramatic propriety in his end, which is said to have been brought about by the fatigue and anxiety he underwent in tending Bishop Butler, at the request of Secker, in his last illness. At any rate, he certainly did attend his old friend at the last, and only survived him a few weeks, Butler dying on June 16, Benson on August 30, 1752.

Bishop of Gloucester.

Pope had contented himself with saying that—

> Manners with candour are to Benson given,

but there is one testimony from a person who knew him intimately which so exactly expresses his character, that it may

fitly conclude this brief notice of this most estimable prelate, particularly as it seems to have the true ring about it, coming from the heart and not being a merely conventional panegyric. "He was from his youth to his latest age the delight of all who knew him. His manner of behaviour was the result of great natural humanity, polished by a thorough knowledge of the world, and the most perfect good-breeding, mixed with a dignity which, on occasions that called for it, no one more properly supported. His piety, though awfully strict, was inexpressibly amiable. It diffused such a sweetness through his temper, and such a benevolence over his countenance, as none who were acquainted with him can ever forget. Bad nerves, bad health, and naturally bad spirits were so totally subdued by it, that he not only seemed, but in reality was, the happiest of men. He looked upon all that the world calls important—its pleasures, its riches, its various competitions —with a playful and good-humoured kind of contempt; and could make persons ashamed of their follies by a raillery that never gave pain to any human being. Of vice he always spoke with severity and detestation, but looked upon the vicious with the tenderness of a pitying angel. His turn was highly sociable and his acquaintance very extensive. Wherever he went, he carried cheerfulness and improvement along with him. As nothing but the interests of Christianity and virtue seemed considerable enough to give him any lasting anxiety, so, on the other hand, there was no accident so trifling from which he could not cause amusement and mirth."

We next come to the most remarkable of all our prelates, and that not only on account of his writings, which are unique, but also on account of his extremely interesting personality. Beyond the fact that Benson was deservedly esteemed by all for his goodness, that he was an active, conscientious bishop, and was singularly free from the prevailing faults of his age, it is difficult to write in detail about him. Even the testimony quoted above is anonymous, though guaranteed by Beilby Porteus. But Benson's friend, Joseph Butler, is a less shadowy personage. We can perceive what manner of man he was. Not merely a general description but a distinct picture, with all its lights and shadows, might be drawn of him, in spite of the fact that the details

of his daily life which have come down to us are but meagre and scanty.

Joseph Butler (1692-1752) was born at Wantage, where his father, then a prosperous linen-draper retired from business, lived at a house called The Priory, where the room in which the great thinker was born is still shown. Like many whose secular occupation is gone, the elder Butler devoted his leisure to ecclesiastical matters, and became a leader of the Presbyterians, who had a strong following at Wantage. He wished his son to enter the Presbyterian ministry, and with that end in view, after a general education, under the Rev. Philip Barton, a clergyman of the Church of England, at the Wantage grammar school, sent him to a dissenting academy kept by Samuel Jones, first at Gloucester and then at Tewkesbury. Among Butler's fellow-pupils at Gloucester and Tewkesbury were several who afterwards rose to high eminence, notably Thomas Secker, with whom he formed a lifelong friendship. The two fast friends, who were nearly contemporaries, remained at Tewkesbury under Samuel Jones until they had become quite young men, and when Butler was twenty-one, and still at Tewkesbury, he ventured to enter into correspondence, as was mentioned in Chapter IV., with the great Dr. Samuel Clarke, as the author of *The Being and Attributes of God* was then called. In his first letter Butler demurred, though with much modesty, to some of the positions laid down in that famous work. He did not venture to give his name at first, but signed himself "A Gentleman of Gloucestershire," and, for fear his letters should miscarry, employed his friend Secker as a sort of amateur postman. Clarke was accustomed to be consulted by young inquirers, but he soon found that his anonymous correspondent was of a different calibre from the rest, and devoted a large amount of time and space to him. No fewer than ten letters, some of considerable length, passed between them, and it is characteristic both of the inquiries and of the honest nature of Butler's mind, that he persisted in pressing his points until he was thoroughly convinced, but when he was convinced, owned it frankly. The correspondence was inserted, as it well deserved to be, in the collected

Joseph Butler.

Correspondence with Dr. Clarke.

Works both of Clarke and Butler. The whole episode is alike creditable both to the precocious and unknown youth of twenty-one and to the matured and famous writer, who was at the very time measuring swords with the formidable Dr. Waterland. It is pleasing to add that the relations between the correspondents did not end with the correspondence. Clarke continued to take an interest in Butler, and was largely instrumental in his becoming not only a member but a clergyman of the Church of England.

For Butler abandoned the idea of the Presbyterian ministry and determined to take holy orders. For this purpose he persuaded his father, though reluctant, to consent to his going to Oxford, and in March 1715 he entered at Oriel College. Oxford did not impress him favourably. Its frivolous lecturers and its unintelligible disputations interrupted instead of helping his studies, and, as he told his friend Clarke, he thought of migrating to Cambridge. One thing, however, he owed to Oriel, for which he had reason to be deeply grateful. He made there the acquaintance of a resident fellow, Edward Talbot, son of William Talbot then Bishop of Oxford, and successively of Salisbury and Durham, who proved the staunchest and most influential of friends. Possibly the friendship of Talbot was the cause of his not leaving Oxford for Cambridge. At any rate, he took his degree from Oriel in 1718, and was in the same year ordained deacon and priest by his friend's father, Dr. Talbot, then Bishop of Salisbury. He was immediately appointed, through the influence of Bishop Talbot and Dr. Clarke, who was Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, Preacher at the Rolls Chapel. The appointment of so young a man, only just ordained, to such a post was a bold venture, but it is needless to add that Butler more than justified it. It was at the Rolls Chapel that he preached his famous *Fifteen Sermons*, which are almost of equal value with the *Analogy* itself. They are only specimens of his preaching, for he himself tells the reader in the Preface "that he is not to look for any particular reason for the choice of the greatest part of these discourses, their being taken from amongst many others preached in the same place, through a course of eight years, being in a great measure accidental."

Ordination.

The *Fifteen Sermons*.

The sermons themselves tally with this account of their selection. Some are abstruse, though of the highest possible value; others so admirably plain and practical that they might be preached with great advantage, and with hardly a word of alteration, before a country congregation. The first three, on Human Nature, are notable instances of the former; that "Upon the character of Balaam" of the latter.

In December 1720 his friend Edward Talbot died, commending with his dying lips Butler and Secker, who had become known to him through Butler, to his father's patronage. The bereaved father at once attended to his son's wish, and in 1721 gave Butler a prebendary at Salisbury, and in 1722, being then translated to Durham, the rich living of Haughton-le-Skerne. He also, as we shall see, provided for Secker. As Butler had before helped Secker, so Secker now helped Butler, for it was through Secker's influence with the bishop that, in 1725, Butler obtained the rich living of Stanhope, whereupon he resigned his preachership at the Rolls, and in 1726 published the *Fifteen Sermons*. For ten years Butler remained thinking and writing in his quiet northern home; eventful years, however, both for Butler and for the Church at large, for he had leisure to elaborate his immortal work. The bishop's eldest son, brother of Butler's lost friend, became Lord Chancellor in 1733, and made Butler his chaplain, and also in July 1736 procured for him a prebend at Rochester. It was the faithful Secker again who was mainly instrumental in drawing him forth from his retreat by mentioning him to Queen Caroline, who loved to have learned men about her. Archbishop Blackburne too replied to the Queen, who asked where he was, or whether he was still living: "He is not dead, madam, but buried." In 1736, the year of the publication of the *Analogy*, she made him her private chaplain or Clerk of the Closet, and commanded his attendance every evening from seven to nine at her philosophical conversation parties. This was a questionable favour to a man like Butler. Hoadly and Sherlock, Clarke and Leibnitz were in their element at such discussions; but Butler was a quiet, retiring man, much more at home when handling his pen than when using his tongue. But the Queen, who was a remarkably clever woman, fully

appreciated his work, and indeed seems to have preferred him to all the rest. She died the following year, and it was Butler who administered the Holy Communion to her on her death-bed. Just before the end she commended Butler, and Butler alone, "particularly and by name," to the King for high office.

George II., who, in spite of his unfaithfulness, had the highest possible opinion of his wife, of course desired to attend to her wishes. He was, moreover, impressed, though not, it is to be feared, lastingly, by a sermon which Butler preached on *The Use of Appetite*, unfortunately not preserved, and accordingly the next year, in 1738, came the offer of a bishopric. But it was the poorest of all bishoprics, that of Bristol. Butler accepted it, but was, not unreasonably, a little disappointed, and expressed his disappointment in language which showed that he was, after all, a true eighteenth-century man. "It was not," he said in his reply to Walpole, through whom, of course, the offer came, "very suitable either to the condition of my fortune or the circumstances of my preferment, nor, as I should have thought, to the recommendation with which I was honoured." As, however, he was allowed to retain his prebend of Rochester and also the rich living of Stanhope, he cannot be said to have fared badly. He continued to hold both these preferments with his bishopric until 1740, when he became Dean of St. Paul's. It is sad to have to note in this connexion that the St. Paul's Register of Preachers, which is admirably kept all through the century, contains no entry of Butler ever having preached there during the time he held the deanery. In 1746 the King made him Clerk of the Closet, and in 1747 the archbishopric of Canterbury was offered to him, and is said to have been declined by him on the lugubrious ground that it was "too late for him to try to support a falling Church." Then in 1750 came the offer of Durham, which he accepted, but only held for two years, for he died on June 16, 1752. His dying hours were soothed by the ministrations of Benson, and when he was too far gone to express himself clearly, he spoke of his still closer friend Secker.

Bishop of Bristol.

Bishop of Durham.

It would be a mistake to regard Butler as a mere bookworm

and recluse. He was not much mixed up in politics, but in practical matters which concerned the Church life of his day he took a deep interest. Indeed, it was these practical matters even more than the theoretical love of truth, though that was a leading feature in his character, which drew from him his masterpieces. It was, as we have already seen, to counteract the practical mischief which he thought the Freethinkers (a vague term which embraced all the Deists and others who do not properly come under that designation) were doing that he wrote the *Analogy*; and no one can read the *Sermons* attentively without perceiving that the preacher's object was at least as much to enforce the plain duties of the Christian life as to discuss abstruse questions. The oft-quoted remark of Horace Walpole, that "the Bishop of Durham had been wafted to that see in a cloud of metaphysics and remained absorbed in it," is misleading. If it meant anything, it meant merely that he did not show that interest in purely political matters which the son of the great minister would naturally think that every public man ought to show, though Horace Walpole cared little for them himself, except so far as they concerned persons. But Butler was never in the clouds. His fault, if fault it was, is that he kept too closely to a pedestrian course on this prosaic earth. If he is obscure, as he sometimes confessedly is, it is not because he soars into lofty regions into which ordinary mortals cannot follow him, but either because he packs too much matter into too small a space, or because his candid mind always led him to write with the opposite side of the question full in view, not always seen by others.

Butler's character.

Butler felt most keenly the evils of the days in which his lot was cast, and thought that his main duty was to impress upon his fellow-men a sense of these evils. Hence there is a tinge of melancholy about him which affected equally his writings and his life. He always regarded the Church as in a state of decay, and the weight of his great name has sanctioned a rather exaggerated idea of the low estate to which the Church had fallen, which, alas! needed no exaggeration. Matters were bad enough, but not so bad as Butler represents them when he says in a memorable passage: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity

is not so much a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it, as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing remained, but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals, for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." Or when he begins his first and only charge to the diocese of Durham, "It is impossible for me, my brethren, to forbear lamenting with you the general decay of religion in this nation; which is now observed by every one, and has been for some time the complaint of all serious persons. The influence of it is more and more wearing out the minds of men, even of those who do not pretend to enter into speculations upon the subject; but the number of those who do, and who profess themselves unbelievers, increases, and with their number their zeal. Zeal, it is natural to ask—for what? Why truly *for* nothing, but *against* everything that is good and sacred amongst us." And the remedy which the Evangelical revival, which was just rising above the horizon in Butler's later days, proposed did not at all commend itself to a man of his type of mind.

His pessimism.

In his famous interview with John Wesley at Bristol in 1739 (quoted on pp. 92, 93), he was undoubtedly pained and shocked; and though the conversation between them, as recorded by Wesley himself, must not be taken too literally, because it is scarcely possible for one of the parties to a conversation to fully recollect the words of the other, still Wesley could hardly have been mistaken as to the purport of what Butler said, and he is borne out by the general tenor of the bishop's character, which renders it highly probable that his sentiments would be substantially what Wesley represents them as being. His whole spirit would revolt against anything which would seem to him to savour of "enthusiasm." Yet not Wesley nor Whitefield could see more vividly the crying evils of the time than Butler did; and it is an interesting fact, not generally known, that he was as much concerned in his way for the souls of the miners at Kingswood as either Wesley or Whitefield; but he thought the providing a permanent church for their use a better

Butler and Methodism.

way of doing them good than preaching sensational sermons to them in the open air. He had no object more at heart than the building of this church, and he left £500 to it; but he would also think that it was not such help as that of the Methodists that the time needed. In short, bad as he thought the age was, he was thoroughly imbued with its spirit. He spent his money most lavishly both in building (of which his friend Secker thought he was rather too fond) and in noble acts of charity, which caused him to die a comparatively poor man. But he thought it no harm to hold a rich living in the far north together with a bishopric in the far south-west. He had no fondness for pomp or show and no love of secular business; but he distinctly declined, and rightly declined, to accept Durham, if it was to be shorn of its grandeur by separating it from the lord-lieutenancy of the Palatine county. He would be a Prince-Bishop of Durham or not Bishop of Durham at all. He was utterly opposed to men like Tindal, who set up reason against Revelation; but he had no idea of a higher faculty than reason as needful for the apprehension of spiritual truth, and whether he actually said it or not, we can well believe that he would think any claim to the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit "a horrid thing, a very horrid thing, sir."

Accused of Popery.

For similar reasons, but applied to the opposite end of the scale, his mind would equally revolt against Roman Catholicism, which gives a high place to emotional religion. Nothing can illustrate more forcibly the fact that the Georgian Church combined lax practice with stiff and narrow and most inelastic theory, than the reasons which were alleged for suspecting that Butler was a Papist in disguise, such as that he laid stress in his Durham charge on the advantage of external religion, and ventured to refer to the example in this respect to the Church on the Continent; that he had a cross of white marble on a slab placed over the altar in his private chapel at Bristol; that he inserted a stained window, which, people said, had no doubt been given him by the Pope. A few years after his death it was currently reported that he died in actual communion with the Church of Rome. His nearest and dearest friend, Secker, loyally defended his memory, writing as Misopseudes

in the *Daily Chronicle*—a strange course for an Archbishop of Canterbury to take; but even he regretted the cross.

It is gratifying also to note that in that age of nepotism, when every man in high office both in Church and State was expected to provide handsomely for all his relations, Butler declined to recognise any other claim for preferment than those of merit and work. "I think, my lord, it is a misfortune to be related to you!" exclaimed a disappointed nephew who had ability but who had not used it. His care for the things of the church at Stanhope was characteristic of his thoroughness in all that he undertook. He is recorded in the parish books as attending meetings, consisting of the rector, curate, churchwardens, and the four-and-twenty substantial men, with whom the government of the parish rested, and dealing with such matters as rebuilding a bridge, repairing the church, and providing "cess" or relief for poor parishioners. He also put up a sundial there in 1727, with the characteristic motto "Ut hora sic vita." Astonishing as it may appear to us, there is little doubt that by many of his contemporaries Secker's powers were more highly rated than those of his friend Butler; though it is not difficult to see the reason. Posterity has taken a very different view. Butler's writings are, and deserve to be, immortal. Secker's have long since passed into oblivion. But, on the other hand, Secker's accomplishments were much more varied, and he kept himself far more to the front than ever Butler did.

Thomas Secker.

The early life of Thomas Secker (1693-1768) is almost a repetition of that of Joseph Butler. He was born at Sibthorpe in Northamptonshire, where his father, a pious dissenter, had a small estate of his own. He was educated first at a school kept by Timothy Jollie, a dissenter, at Attercliffe, and was then sent in 1710 to the excellent dissenting academy of Samuel Jones, first at Gloucester and then at Tewkesbury, the expenses of his education being partly defrayed by the well-known Dr. Isaac Watts. Butler joined him at the same school, and they became, as has been seen, fast friends for life. Both were intended for the nonconformist ministry, and both drifted away from their early opinions towards the Church. But Butler was in this respect before his friend and helped to win

him over. Unlike Butler, Secker seems to have gone through an intermediate stage. In 1716 he was uncertain whether he should enter the dissenting ministry or receive holy orders in the Church of England, and for a time studied medicine, took a medical degree at Leyden in 1721, after having attended medical lectures in Paris from 1718 to 1719, and resided three months in Leyden. There he met Martin Benson, who was on his travels before ordination, and Benson became the third of the trio. The united efforts of Benson and Butler, combined with the arguments of Samuel Clarke, with whom he no doubt had become connected through Butler, led him at last "to conform"; and then a true eighteenth-century argument was used to persuade him to take holy orders. Butler used his influence with his powerful friend Edward Talbot on behalf of his other friend, and extracted a promise from him that if Secker entered the ministry of the Church, he should be provided for. Secker accordingly entered as a gentleman-commoner at Exeter College, Oxford, and having taken his degree after only twelve months' residence, his Leyden degree being taken into consideration, and the Chancellor having written a commendatory letter to the Convocation, was ordained in 1722, of course by Bishop Talbot, Edward Talbot's father, who, following out the wishes of his dying son, quickly and handsomely provided for Secker as well as for Butler; in fact, Secker seems to have been the more favoured of the two.

Bishop Talbot gave him the rich living of Houghton-le-Spring in 1724 (which he afterwards exchanged for Ryton), and also a prebend in Durham Cathedral. In 1725 Secker still further cemented his friendship with Benson by marrying his sister Catherine Benson, a most happy match. In 1733 he was appointed, on the recommendation of Bishop Gibson, to the important rectory of St. James's, Piccadilly. A significant side-light is thrown upon the condition of St. Paul's Cathedral at the time of this appointment. Dr. Tyrwhit, who had succeeded Dr. Clarke at St. James's in 1729, found that preaching in so large a church endangered his health. Bishop Gibson, Tyrwhit's father-in-law, therefore proposed to the Crown that he should be made residentiary Canon of St. Paul's, and that Secker should succeed him in Piccadilly. It is almost impossible for us to conceive how

even preaching in the then enclosed choir could be less arduous than preaching in St. James's, Piccadilly, except that he would not have to preach so often. In 1735 Secker became Bishop of Bristol, and continued to hold with the bishopric both his rectory and his prebend. In 1737, on the advancement of Potter, he became Bishop of Oxford, and in 1750 succeeded his friend Butler as Dean of St. Paul's. Then, and not till then, did he resign his rectory and his prebend. He continued to hold the bishopric of Oxford and the deanery of St. Paul's until 1758, when he became Archbishop of Canterbury, and held the primacy until his death in 1768.

Secker was not, like his friend Benson, a man whom all the world praised. On the contrary, he was the subject of ill-natured gossip, much of which was manifestly untrue; indeed, some of it was indignantly and convincingly disposed of by his biographer, Beilby Porteus, a man whose testimony is unimpeachable. But it is possible, indeed probable, that he may have fallen into the same sort of errors into which Potter fell, and owing to the same cause. Both were men who had risen, and complaints of the same kind were made against both. Benson was "to the manner born" and was therefore not so uplifted by his elevation. That Secker was a worthy man who strove earnestly to do his best for the Church to which he was a convert, and which he loved with all a convert's love, is beyond a doubt. He was not above the faults of his age. The facts of his life, as given above, show that he had no scruples about being a pluralist. He had a morbid dread of enthusiasm, and, with the best intentions, unconsciously helped to keep the Church at that dead level which so fatally crippled its energies in the eighteenth century. His watchwords were Reasonableness and Moderation—excellent things in their way, but too often calculated to repress zeal. Like his friend Butler and others, he took a most gloomy view of the situation. Nothing could be more depressing than the keynote which he sounded in his first charge to the clergy of the Oxford Diocese:—

"Yet this we cannot be mistaken in, that an open and professed disregard to religion is become, through a variety of unhappy causes, the distinguishing character of the present

age; that this evil is grown to a great height in the metropolis of the nation, is daily spreading through every part of it; and, bad in itself as any can be, must of necessity bring in most others after it. Indeed, it hath already brought in such dissoluteness and contempt of principle in the higher part of the world, and such profligate intemperance and fearlessness of committing crimes in the lower, as must, if this torrent of iniquity stop not, become absolutely fatal. And, God knows, far from stopping, it receives, through the ill designs of some persons and the inconsiderateness of others, a continual increase. Christianity is now ridiculed and railed at, with very little reserve; and the teachers of it, without any at all. Indeed, with respect to us, the rule which most of our adversaries appear to have set themselves is, to be, at all adventures, as bitter as they can, and they follow it not only beyond truth, but beyond probability."

The surprising thing is this, that, like Butler, he did not perceive that the sort of decent mediocrity which was his ideal was not sufficiently stimulating to remedy the evils which he deplored. He was equally against Popery, Methodism, Latitudinarianism (which he called Hoadleian divinity — Christianity *secundum usum Winton*), but in excluding everything which appeared to make the very faintest approach to any of these, he was forced to move in a rather narrow groove, and also to condemn the working of the Church of his adoption, which, as it then was, certainly did not deserve his commendation. It was not so much a lack of courage, for he was brave enough when he knew that he was right—witness his bold advocacy of the scheme for bishops in America, in spite of strong opposition on both sides of the Atlantic—but sheer lack of perception. This was all the more provoking, because his mental powers and attainments were much above the average, and justice has hardly been done to them by posterity. Contemporary writers showed their appreciation of him in the most practical of all ways, namely, by submitting their works to his revision before publication; and it is highly probable that, among others, the *Fifteen Sermons* and the *Analogy* passed through the crucible of his criticism in manuscript. He had so high a reputation as a Hebraist that, according to his

The evils of the time.

biographer, scarcely any book on the Hebrew language was sent to the press without being first submitted to him for revision; and in spite of his modest disclaimer, his *Concio ad Clerum*, written in 1761 for the opening of Convocation but not delivered, shows plainly that he was an excellent Latin scholar; whilst his sermons, of which no less then one hundred and forty have been published, and his charges, show that he had a good command of his mother tongue as well as a robust, manly, sensible mind. Nothing more clearly shows his mind than the *Concio*. In it he discussed the position of Convocation. The Synod is a part of the ancient constitution of the realm, no less than the Houses of Lords and Commons; and though its action be suspended, it nowise ceases to exist. It had done good work in the past; and its future services, when opportunity should arise, must not be lightly prejudged. Meanwhile, it was a stately meeting of Church representatives met for prayer and mutual counsel and its testification of loyalty. Although he was well aware that the constitution of the Church was mutilated without its Convocation, he deprecated precipitate action. He would willingly wait till controverted subjects could be debated in a calmer spirit. Meanwhile, if they could not construct canons, they must seek by word and example to instil obedience to the canon of Holy Scripture. If they could not fulminate anathemas against the lukewarm, they must endeavour all the more to confute them by their arguments.

The *Concio*.

Naturally Secker was brought much more into contact with the Court and with political life than any of the other five prelates with whom we have been dealing. In his earlier years, as Bishop of Oxford, his standing at Court with the Queen and the Prince of Wales (but not with George II., who hated him) was high. As Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, he baptized all the children of the Prince of Wales except two, and the Prince was very fond of him and bestowed on him several marks of favour. Secker did not attend the Prince's Court after the unfortunate rupture between George II. and his son, and it is supposed that he incurred the displeasure of the King because of his failure as an intermediary between the King and the

Secker and the Court.

Prince of Wales. Whatever the cause, the King did not speak to him for a good many years, and both in his reign and in that of George III., his grandson, for Frederick, Prince of Wales, died in 1751, he was consulted by the throne much less than any archbishop had been for many a long year before. There were those who thought that this should have been resented; but Secker simply answered that "he had as sharp a sense of the indignity as any one could have, but he was very unwilling to break altogether with the Court, for then he was certain he could prevail in nothing; he might now be able to carry some points for the good of the Church." He baptized, married, and crowned George III., who seems to have liked him, and he might, perhaps, have been more at the young King's Court, if it had not been for ill-health.

His action in the House of Lords was characterised by the same peaceful determination to do what he thought was right and to do all the good he could, and for the most part he took the right side. Thus in 1743 he led the bishops in their opposition to the Spirituous Liquors Bill, on the ground that they should "not sacrifice for ways and means the health, the industry, and the lives of the people." We find him also supporting a Bill to make provision for the widows and children of the ministers of the Church of Scotland. On the Bill of 1748 for disarming the Highlanders, he spoke against that part of it which refused toleration to all Scottish episcopal orders that had not been conferred or confirmed by an English or Irish bishop. And later, in 1753 and 1754, he stood out for toleration on the question of repealing the Act for the naturalisation of Jews; and advocated very strongly, as against the dissenters here and the New England colonists, the sending out of one or more duly consecrated bishops to the episcopalians in the New England settlements.

Secker and politics.

The six bishops whose lives have been sketched in these two chapters were certainly the leading men in the Church during our period. Moreover, they were the six with whom Methodism, which was beyond all doubt the burning question of the day, came most into contact. The reader will understand that they would not have much sympathy with the movement, though they honestly

The bishops and Methodism.

endeavoured to do justice to it, as no one owned more generously than its great leader himself. There is not one of the six of whom John Wesley has not a kind word to say. Of course, they disagreed with the line he took, as he disagreed with the line they took, but it was left to lesser men to speak and write of them as if they were "fighting against God." They were as honest in their convictions as the Methodists themselves were. The Methodist divergence from the Church is the more to be regretted, because the Methodists were essentially reformers, and these good bishops were painfully conscious that the Church needed a revival of spiritual life. Never indeed did it need such a revival more than in their times, for it reached its nadir between the years embraced in this period, 1738-1760.

AUTHORITIES.—Some account of Bishop Benson is given in Bishop Beilby Porteus's Life of Secker affixed to the six-volume edition of Secker's *Works*. On Bishop Butler add to authorities previously cited the *Life* by Bartlett, and the excellent account of his times, works, and opinions in the *Life* by W. A. Spooner. Butler's *Correspondence with Dr. Samuel Clarke* is given in full in Dean Bernard's edition. William Morley Egglestone, in his *Stanhope Memorials of Bishop Butler* (1878), has brought together many curious and interesting details concerning Butler's tenure of the Durham living. The summary of Secker's *Concio* is taken from Abbey's *English Church and its Bishops*.

CHAPTER IX

BISHOP WILSON

It is a great relief to churchmen to turn for a while from the state of things described in the previous chapters, in which we cannot fully sympathise with any of the religious parties, to a little island diocese in which a wholly different view meets the eye; and as the man who was the life and soul as well as the chief pastor of the see passed away towards the close of the period now before us, this seems the proper place in which to consider him. Need it be said that the diocese is that of Sodor and Man, and the man the apostolic Thomas Wilson (1663-1755). His history has been written many times by different pens and from different points of view. A brief account of these *Lives* will be found at the end of this chapter.

Thomas Wilson.

Bishop Wilson was one of those men who in their writings are themselves, and his writings therefore are essential to a full knowledge of the man. As we read the *Maxims*, the *Sacra Privata*, the *Sermons*, we read the man. The *Sermons* are perhaps the most persuasive, and therefore the best of his day, better than those of Sherlock and Secker, the most admired preachers of his later life; better than those of Atterbury and Smalridge, the most admired in his earlier years. There are a quaint simplicity and homeliness, a tenderness combined with great thoughtfulness, a thorough manliness, an intense earnestness without the faintest tincture of affectation, which render them, and indeed all his writings, most fascinating. His conception of Christianity was fundamentally masculine. He was most essentially a preacher to

and a writer for men; and though there is always great tenderness exhibited, yet it is as far as may be from maudlin sentimentality. Sentiment indeed he had, and that of the purest kind; but there was no sentimentality about him or his works. Possibly admiration of the man may lead us to exaggerate the merits of the writer, for he was a higher type of man than any of the preachers with whom he has just been compared. For the reader no less than for the hearer—

> Truth from his lips prevails with double sway.

And as Church history should surely be a history of goodness rather than of badness, it may not be regarded as inappropriate to linger fondly at some little length upon his unique character and career, or rather upon the later part of it; for at the date at which the present volume opens he was already at the close of the middle stage of life. When George I. began to reign, Thomas Wilson had been Bishop of Sodor and Man for sixteen years, and had already shown that the prevailing faults of his day were in him conspicuous by their absence.

He was born at Burton, in Cheshire, and probably that natural instinct of piety which he seems to have possessed was hereditary on his mother's side, for his mother was sister of Richard Sherlock, Rector of Winwick, one of the exemplary parish priests of the seventeenth century. At any rate, he clearly owed much to his uncle Sherlock; for, having received his early education at the King's School, Chester, he went, as his uncle had gone before him, to Trinity College, Dublin. It is curious that the best clergyman of his day does not appear to have been originally intended for a clergyman at all. He first devoted himself to medicine, until he was persuaded by a fellow-student, Michael Hewetson, to turn his thoughts to a clerical life. Having taken his degree, he was ordained deacon by Dr. William Moreton, Bishop of Kildare, in 1686, and became curate to his uncle at Winwick, having charge of an outlying chapelry. There could be no better trainer for a young clergyman, and Wilson spent the first five years of his ministerial life under his care. He then became domestic chaplain to the ninth Earl of Derby, as his uncle had been to the eighth earl, tutor to his eldest son, and master

Early life.

of the alms-house at Lathom, the emolument of the first employment being only £30 and of the second only £20 a year. But his patron also offered him the valuable living of Badsworth in the West Riding, which Wilson at once declined, as he had resolved never to be a non-resident incumbent. So far from being a parasite and hanger-on of a great family, Wilson, young as he was, had the courage to remonstrate with, and even to rebuke, his patron when he thought he was going the wrong way. And it is to the credit of both parties that, instead of giving offence, he only drew the earl more closely to him by so doing. Thus, while still quite a young man, he had already shown that he was an exception to what was far too much a general rule in two respects. Domestic chaplains were much too ready to curry favour with their patrons, and the clergy generally too ready to accept posts whether they attended to the duties of them or not. Wilson would do neither the one nor the other.

A third instance of his exceptional character soon appeared. In 1697 Derby, as Lord of Man, offered him the bishopric. But the mitre, which was eagerly sought after by so many, had no attraction for him, for he promptly declined it; and it was only by vehement persuasion that he was at last, as he says, "forced into the bishopric." It was only worth £300 a year, and the earl again offered him the rectory of Badsworth, to hold *in commendam*, but Wilson again refused. He had no value for money except as a means of doing good. He had for some time kept what he called a "poor drawer" —devoting first a tenth, then a fifth, then a third, then a half of his income to charitable purposes. So in January 1698 began that wonderful career which lasted for nearly fifty-seven years, and which awakened, as well it might, the astonishment and admiration of all right-thinking men. It is only fair to the rulers of the Church in England to remember that the circumstances of the Isle of Man were peculiar, and that its life was not shackled by many of those wretched political arrangements which, while nominally safe-guards, were in reality the greatest hindrances to the Church's usefulness. There was no silencing of Convocation there through the intervention of the civil power, for

Conditions of his diocese.

fear that it should do mischief to that power. There was no Act of Uniformity in force there to prevent the Church from adapting itself to new needs and altered circumstances. There were no hindrances there, springing from a misconception of the functions of Church and State, to that enforcement of a "godly discipline," which here prevent the Church from doing more than express once a year a feeble wish that it might be restored.

In Man the bishop had a far more free hand than his brother bishops had on this side the water. And nobly did he make use of his opportunities. He made his Convocation a reality while here it was a farce, and being a thoroughly well-instructed as well as a most earnest churchman, he put it upon a proper Church footing. Its functions were most clearly and correctly defined by him. "Convocations in the Isle of Man are not like those in England, which require the King's authority to warrant them. They are only diocesan synods, and are either annual, appointed by statute, or occasional, when the bishop calls together all, or as many of the clergy as he thinks proper, to communicate to them, or to advise with them about any matter of moment which concerns the Church, which every bishop in England may do and does in their ordinary visitation, and which has now been customary in this diocese."

While thoroughly appreciating the beauties of our Liturgy, he did not look upon it as a sort of ark which no Uzzah must touch with profane hands, and therefore he had no scruple about issuing orders for occasional services, and composing, as he was thoroughly competent to do, and putting forth new prayers for public use. He was not tempted, still less indeed almost required, as bishops in England were, to be perpetually dancing attendance at Court; therefore he had time to do things which it was physically impossible for them to do. In short, he devoted his whole time to his diocese, rarely leaving it even for a short visit during all the fifty-seven years of his incumbency.

Feeling that the character of a Church depends greatly upon the character of its clergy, he gave his first attention to that, and especially to the candidates for holy orders. At his annual Convocation he used to propose the names of

those who sought to be ordained to the assembled clergy for their approbation, and when they approved, he would beg them to keep a watchful eye upon the candidates, so that when they were called upon to sign their testimonials they might do it with a safe conscience. The candidates themselves he was wont to take to reside with him in his own family for a whole year before their ordination, and used to read the Greek Testament with them every day. Knowing that when a bishop was expected, a parish was put in order, and that therefore its state furnished no criterion of the ordinary work of the parson, he used to pay surprise visits, appearing suddenly on a Sunday morning at churches in the most distant parts of his diocese, and judging for himself how they were going on. Next to the Church, the school was his care, and he never rested until he had established parochial schools all through his diocese long before such institutions were at all common in England. All of them were of a distinctly Church type, and he laid great stress upon the bounden duty of the clergy to attend to them personally, recurring again and again to the subject in his charges. Nowhere was Dr. Bray's scheme of establishing parochial libraries so successfully carried out as in the Isle of Man, and that entirely through the efforts of Bishop Wilson. It was one of the first objects which engaged his attention after his settlement in the island, and before long every parish had a valuable collection of books, chiefly on divinity.

His clergy.

His schools.

Not the least valuable of the books were his own writings, most of which were written by him in the first instance for the benefit of his own people. His *Principles and Duties of Christianity*, a sort of enlarged Catechism, was the first book published in the Manx language, which he took great pains in learning, in order that he might appeal the more closely to the hearts of his people by addressing them in their own mother-tongue; and there were in time few families, even among the poorest in the Isle, which had not, besides a Bible and a Prayer Book, some of the bishop's own publications in Manx or English. He set about making a translation of the Bible into Manx, but, with all his other work, the task was too gigantic for him to complete. Nor was it only the spiritual condition of the diocese to

which he attended, though all was subservient to that. He used the medical knowledge which he had acquired in his early training for the good of his people. He set up a drug-shop, and gave advice and medicine to the poor gratis, and was actually for some time the only physician in the island. When other doctors came (and among them was his own future biographer, Clement Cruttwell) he gave up to them the rich, indeed, all the patients who could pay, retaining only those who could not pay as his own. He encouraged agriculture in every way; had manufactories of different kinds on his demesne, so that he could give employment and not encourage idleness; planted trees in all directions; added to the "poor drawer" in his bureau a "poor chest" in his barn, which he always kept full of corn and meal for the indigent; purchased assortments of spectacles to be distributed among the aged poor, so that when their eyesight was failing, they might still see to read their Bibles, and, as he said, "use their glasses to help them to thread a needle and mend their cloaks."

Medical work.

All this must have cost money, and we naturally ask, Where did the money come from? How was it that Wilson, with his poor little bishopric of £300 a year, and certainly with no large private means, could do more than others could with as many, nay, with double and treble as many thousands? Among his other merits Bishop Wilson was evidently an excellent man of business, thrifty himself and a preacher of thrift to others. Then he was absolutely unselfish; and men's expenses are chiefly those which they spend upon themselves, and, if it be added, "upon their families," this too will help to answer the question, for Bishop Wilson was blessed with an admirable wife, like-minded with himself, and they brought up their family on these principles. He lost her prematurely and was a widower for fifty years, but while she was with him she entered heart and soul into all his schemes. Finally, that noble unselfishness which enabled Bishop Wilson to do so much with so little is happily infectious, and besides raising up for him liberal friends like the exemplary Lady Betty Hastings, it no doubt stimulated many in the island to take their share in the cost which his many schemes for good must have entailed.

Finance.

The most striking feature in Bishop Wilson's wonderful career has yet to be noticed. He restored in the Isle of Man the primitive discipline which had long been, as it still is, in abeyance almost everywhere else. His views on the subject are strongly expressed in the *Sacra Privata*. He says: "Church discipline is for the honour of God, for the safety of religion, the good of sinners, and for the public weal, that sinners may not run headlong to ruin without being made sensible of their danger; that others may see and fear and not go on presumptuously in their evil ways; that the house of God may not become a den of thieves; and that judgments may not be poured down on the whole community. The most effectual way of answering these ends is to exercise a strict, impartial discipline. First, to withhold from offenders the benefit of the Holy Sacrament, till they behave themselves so as to be worthy of so great a blessing; and secondly, if they continue obstinate (all proper methods being used to reclaim them), to excommunicate them, and to oblige all sober Christians not to have familiar converse with them." The same view is not less strongly expressed in his sermon on Joshua vii. 19, 20, which is worth study, because it shows the mind of the eighteenth century on its best side. It is as practical as the strictest Scots Kirk-session or the Roman confessional. Confession of sin, Wilson says, is needed not only to God for His glory, but also to men in cases in which scandal has been occasioned, and it will inevitably follow upon a true awakening of conscience. Men should submit themselves willingly to Church censures from a feeling of conscientious regard to the general well being of the Church, and not from fear of fines and imprisonments.

Church discipline.

But the initiative, as the bishop points out, may have to come from the Church itself. The governors of the Church have a power from Christ of a spiritual order. Their duty is to receive into the Church such as are fit to be members of it, to sustain and tend those thus admitted, to offer to God the oblations of His people, and to administer those Sacraments without which, so he put it, we cannot hope to be saved. The clergy have also the power, after admonishing, rebuking, and withstanding the disobedient and profane, to cast them out of the Church—a power given to them for edification, not for

mere love of authority; a power extending to the denial of the Sacraments to all such as render themselves unworthy to partake of them; a power to close the Church against offenders and to charge all other Christians not to company with them; a power which if rejected carries with it the rejection of Christ; a power which can loose as well as bind, which can receive back again as well as excommunicate.

With Bishop Wilson writing was always followed up by action, and he made Church discipline such a reality as it had never been for many a long year. He drew up a code of "Ecclesiastical Constitutions" for his diocese, with reference to which Lord Chancellor King said, "If the ancient discipline of the Church were lost, it might be found in all its purity in the Isle of Man"—a very strong testimony to Wilson's legal competency, seeing that it came from one who would regard the matter from a lawyer's rather than an ecclesiastical point of view. Bishop Wilson was a strict, not to say a severe, disciplinarian, and he drew the reins more tightly than even he could have done elsewhere, more tightly, perhaps, than may seem to some of us to have been wise or right. But his position in the Isle was very peculiar. It seemed as if there was something like the state of things which prevailed in England before the Norman Conquest, when the Bishop and Ealdorman sat side by side at the shire-mote to expound God's law and the world's law. Bishop Wilson has been charged, even by his admirers, with too great severity, but before admitting the charge, we must take into full account the far greater severity in all kinds of punishment which prevailed then than which prevails now. At any rate, the rigorous system worked well and smoothly.

It was applied impartially to clergy and laity alike, and covered a large number of offences. A certain John Robinson of Kirk Arbory had defamed Mr. Deemster Parr, saying that he was a Church robber. Here is the sentence: "It is hereby ordered that the said John Robinson shall be immediately committed to St. German's prison, there to continue till he give in sufficient security to do three Sundays' penance, after a very solemn and humble manner, viz. one in Kirk Arbory, one in Kirk Christ Rushen, and one in Kirk Malew, and in each church humbly

Penances.

ask forgiveness of the said Deemster Parr, and lay his finger on his mouth, saying, 'Tongue, thou hast lied,' and all along so demean himself as becomes a true penitent, and to behave himself for the future respectfully towards the said Deemster." Sometimes the penance was still further prolonged. One John Kneale was to go on nine different Sundays to nine different churches, and at each to ask the rector or vicar as he went into morning service as follows: "Sir, I pray for Christ's sake to satisfy your congregation that I am heartily grieved for my great offences against God and man; that I purpose by the grace of God to become a new man. To which end I desire yours and their pardon and prayers." And he was to wait at the church doors till service was over, to receive a written answer from the minister, "after he has strictly examined him before the people touching the truth and sincerity of his repentance."

The severity of some of Wilson's punishments may be seen from the following sentence inflicted upon a woman: "Forasmuch as neither Christian advice nor gentle methods of punishment are found to have any effect on Kath Kinred of Kirk Christ, a notorious strumpet, who has brought forth three illegitimate children, and still continues to stroll about the country . . . it is hereby ordered that she be dragged after a boat in the sea at Peeltown on Wednesday the 17th (being the fair of St. Patrick), at the height of the market. To which end, a boat and boat's crew are to be charged by the General Sumner, and the constables and soldiers of the garrison are . . . to be aiding and assisting in seeing this censure performed." The sentence was signed on March 15, 1713, by Wilson and William Walker, whom the bishop had recently nominated to the office of vicar-general, as a man after his own heart. No enthusiasm for discipline can, however, excuse this disgraceful and monstrous sentence, which was as unchristian as the sin it punished. It chanced, in this case, that St. Patrick's Day was too stormy, and so the sentence was carried out on St. German's Day instead. Further, the woman again relapsed, was again tried and sentenced to the same punishment, in addition to twenty-one days' imprisonment and the performance of public penance in all the churches of the island. If this did not

prove effectual she was then to be excluded from the society of Christians. It is to be noted that the discipline this time did its work, and the bishop ordered her to be received into the peace of the Church.

As would naturally be expected, offences against the marriage law were dealt with by the bishop, and dealt with in a very thorough manner. It was reported that a certain John Rowlandson was living with "his former wife's own sister, and that they had come to the island to avoid the prosecution justly due to that sin." They were presented before the Court, and acknowledged the truth of the allegation. In the first instance legal evidence was not forthcoming, and as an *interim* measure they were "in open Court pronounced separate *a mensa et toro*, to give bonds not to cohabit, to be alternately confined in St. German's fourteen days, and afterwards to perform public penance in all the churches of the island." It was later discovered that they had been married by a minister of the Church of England in a chapel-of-ease in Cartmel parish in Lancashire, and the final decree was then signed by the bishop. It concluded thus: "We do, therefore, *In Nomine Dei*, declare the said marriage to be null and void, and hereby pronounce the said parties to be divorced *a vinculo matrimonii*, and do require them forthwith to perform the censure passed on them for their incest"; which they did in so satisfactory a manner that the bishop directed them to be received again into the communion of the Church.

The discipline of the clergy necessarily formed part of the system, and was faithfully administered. In nineteen years, among the twenty or twenty-four clergy on the island, six suspensions occurred, one cleric being suspended twice. We find one deacon suspended for, among other things, having married two couples in an uncanonical way, without consent of parents; the suspension was for three years according to canon. Another was suspended for three years for disturbing the inhabitants of Castletown, by firing of guns in the dead of night upon a mountebank's stage.

The bishop's ecclesiastical discipline was patiently submitted to until 1713, when a new Governor, Alexander Horne, with a new Archdeacon, Robert Horrobin, who was

also the Governor's chaplain, appeared on the scene. The happy relations between the civil and ecclesiastical powers were then interrupted; a series of difficulties arose, into the details of which it is not necessary to enter, and the upshot was that Bishop Wilson, refusing to pay the fine which was imposed upon him by the civil power, was imprisoned in the common gaol at Castle Rushen for two months, and the harsh treatment he received left lifelong effects upon him. In most cases where there is any legal contest between the clergy and the laity, public sympathy is on the side of the laity, but in this case it was quite the reverse. Bishop Wilson was regarded as a noble confessor, and his opponents as cruel persecutors. But for the intercession of the bishop himself, the people would have mobbed and perhaps pulled down the Governor's house. They crowded round the prison, from the bars of which the bishop used to preach to them and exhort them, and they attended better to exhortations given to them in these extraordinary circumstances and dramatic surroundings than to those delivered from the pulpit. Hence Wilson used to say that his diocese was never better governed than when he was in prison, and that, but for his health's sake, he would have been content to live in prison all his life. But his health did suffer, and on that account, and also in the interests of justice, he felt it his duty, as he said, "to appeal unto Cæsar," that is to say, to the King in Council, who reversed the judgment and he was released.

Wilson in prison.

His expenses, however, had been very great, and the King, George I., offered him the bishopric of Exeter as a compensation for them, but he declined it. It was not the first nor yet the last time a richer bishopric was offered to him, but always with the same result. In 1711 he had paid one of his rare visits to London, and on that occasion preached before Queen Anne, who was so pleased with the elegance and simplicity of his sermon, as well as with the account she had heard of his character and of his noble work in the Isle, that she offered him an English bishopric, which he refused, saying that "by the blessing of God he could do some little good in the little spot that he then resided on; whereas if he were removed to a larger

sphere, he might be lost and forget his duty to his flock and to his God." Again, in 1735, he visited England for the last time, and was introduced to the King, George II., and Queen Caroline, who in vain pressed an English bishopric upon him. He attended a levee of the Queen, where several bishops were present, to whom Caroline turned and said, "See here, my lords, is a bishop who does not come for a translation." Upon which Wilson made the oft-quoted reply, "No, an't please your Majesty, I will not leave my wife in my old age because she is poor." So he returned to his island diocese, which had the privilege of his ministrations for twenty years longer. And when at last he was called to his rest, it happily received a like-minded successor in Bishop Mark Hildesley, who completed the work of translating, or procuring the translation of, the whole Bible into Manx, a work which Wilson had begun, and which he always had deeply at heart. Bishop Hildesley strove, though, as he himself modestly said, *haud passibus aequis*, to follow in the steps of his saintly predecessor. So the diocese of Man was peculiarly favoured.

AUTHORITIES.—The Life of Bishop Wilson was first written by Clement Cruttwell, the original editor of the collected *Works*. Cruttwell had been a medical man, but was led by his study of Bishop Wilson's works to take holy orders. His *Life* appeared first in 1785, and is prefixed to the early editions (folio and quarto) of the *Works*. In 1819 the Rev. Hugh Stowell, Rector of Ballayle, who was constantly brought into contact with men who had known the Bishop personally and idolised his memory, wrote a second *Life*, in which he allowed the Bishop, "as far as was practicable," to relate his own history, to communicate his own sentiments, and to draw his own picture. Stowell was an Evangelical (the father of a far more famous Evangelical), and, though in 1833 Richard B. Hone had written a brief life in his *Lives of Eminent Christians*, it was not until 1863 that there appeared a much more detailed and exhaustive *Life*, written by one who certainly had more sympathy with one side of the Bishop's life. After sixteen years of engrossing labour and two visits to the Isle of Man, John Keble published his *Life* in the two volumes which serve as an Introduction to the complete collection of the Bishop's *Works* in the Anglo-Catholic Library (six volumes). Wilson's *Maxims of Piety and Christianity* has been recently edited with Introduction and Notes by Frederic Relton as one of the volumes of the English Theological Library.

CHAPTER X

THE LATER WORK OF WILLIAM LAW—THE EARLY EVANGELICALS

ALTHOUGH Bishop Wilson's career, which has been briefly described in the preceding chapter, was in many respects unique, it must not be supposed that he stood alone as a veritable saint in this dark day. There were many others of true saintly character, whose record is on high. Most of these were more or less connected with the Methodist movement, or with the Evangelical school, which was beginning to rise towards the close of this period. But there were others. William Law, for example, certainly did not identify himself, or even sympathise fully, with either Methodists or Evangelicals, although he was closely connected with the rise of both. Most of the leaders in both movements express very strongly their obligations to his early writings, the *Serious Call* and *Christian Perfection.* John and Charles Wesley, Whitefield, Scott, Venn, Newton, and Thomas Adam all agree in bearing testimony to the influence upon their teaching and lives of the recluse of King's Cliffe. Law lived on until the reign of George III., dying at Eastertide, 1761, and although his conscientious scruples as a Non-Juror cut him off from the active ministry of the Church, yet he continued to serve it in his own way to the best of his ability, and that ability was very great. He had a far more powerful and original, though not so practical a mind as Bishop Wilson, and though his mysticism tinged and modified his churchmanship, it never destroyed it, while his saintly and self-denying life will bear comparison even with that of the great Bishop of Sodor and Man.

William Law.

The literary activity of William Law divides itself into two well-defined periods. To the earlier one, symbolised by the *Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* and the *Serious Call*, attention has already been drawn. But at some period prior to 1737 he had come under the influence (which to him was almost dominant) of the writings of the famous Bohemian shoemaker and mystic, Jacob Behmen. This influence brought Law into line with the celebrated Cambridge Platonists of an earlier generation, and it certainly was the cause of his writing some of his most remarkable and helpful books. Thus in 1737 he penned a reply to his old antagonist Hoadly's book, published anonymously, on the Lord's Supper. It is entitled *A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book called "A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."* William Law maintained that the ordinance is not merely a positive ordinance, as Hoadly held, but that it is based upon the very nature of things as they are, and should be understood as it came to be understood by the Apostles themselves under the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. The following passage illustrates both his own position and that of his antagonist: "Take the Words of the Institution alone as the Apostles first heard them, understood only according to the *Common Rules* of speaking, and there is nothing in them but that *poor* Conception which they had of them *at that time*, and such as did them no good; and then also we have that knowledge of this Institution which this Author pleads for. But take the same Words of the Institution, understood and interpreted according to the *Articles* of the Christian Faith, and seen in that *Light* in which the Apostles afterwards saw them, when they *knew* their Saviour, and then everything that is great and adorable in the Redemption of Mankind, everything that can delight, comfort, and support the heart of a Christian, is found to be centred in this Holy Sacrament." This thesis he proceeds to elaborate at length. The work is in every way one of first importance.

Law's mystical writings.

Answer to Hoadly on the Lord's Supper.

The *Demonstration* was followed in 1739 by a book on *The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration*. This is full of mysticism. In it William Law passes beyond the range of ecclesiastical controversies and lives in the

purer atmosphere of high spiritual thought and aspiration. Bare mention need only be made of the *Earnest and Serious Answer to Dr. Trapp's Discourse of the Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous over-much* (1740), and of *The Appeal to all that Doubt or Disbelieve the Truths of the Gospel* (1740), crucial and important as they both are. Two are better known and are destined to become more and more fully understood, viz. *The Spirit of Prayer* (1749, 1750) and *The Spirit of Love* (1752 and 1754). In these William Law reaches his highest point of spiritual composition, and breathes an air similar to that of the *Paradiso* in the *Divina Commedia*. To know these books is to love them, and to know them and their fellows is to cease to wonder at the enormous influence wielded by their author, a man never, or if ever, in his early days only, heard at all from a pulpit, who took no active part in the ecclesiastical and political troubles of the time, but who was content to write books and tracts which were read then far and near, and which have been the real foundation of all the important religious movements since his day. It would be easy to trace the Tractarian movement, the school of Frederick Maurice, the school of *Lux Mundi*, and the yet more recent mystical school, to a study of the writings of William Law. Truly of him as of no one else to the same extent during our period can it be said to-day, "He being dead yet speaketh."

Spirit of Prayer and of Love.

Between the Methodist movement and the Evangelical revival, both starting from the spiritual impulse imparted by William Law, there were many points of contact and many of disagreement. They were agreed in their insistence upon the necessity of spiritual religion, and of this as given by the immediate and individual reception of the influence of the Holy Spirit; in their belief in the total depravity of man despite the *quam longissime* of the Article; in their uncompromising hostility to certain forms of amusement such as theatres and dancing. The theatre, it must be remembered, was still very little better than that of the Restoration; there was not much of it, there being only two playhouses in London; but what there was, was bad. To other forms of recreation such as great

Methodism and Evangelicalism compared.

dinner-parties they had not the same objection. They were alike in their puritanical observance of the Lord's Day or Sabbath, for they had no inkling that the true Sabbath was Saturday, though a little knowledge of Italian would have taught them the distinction between *Sabato* and *Domenica*. In all this they were agreed, and further agreed in differing from the contemporary dissenters either by taking no part at all in politics, or by declaring their most staunch loyalty to the throne. They differed most widely on points of doctrine. The Methodists, following John Wesley, were, broadly speaking, Arminians, while the Evangelicals, broadly speaking, sympathised rather with Whitefield and were Calvinists; some, like Toplady, were very strong Calvinists.

They differed also in their views and practice of Church order. The Evangelical leaders as a body were parochial clergymen. The Methodists held with Wesley that they could and should go anywhere, and we find Wesley himself, carrying out his theory that the world was his parish, invading the parishes of Venn at Huddersfield and Walker at Truro, both, be it noted, prominent Evangelicals. Wesley indeed did not believe in the efficiency of any man's work except his own. "We know several regular clergymen," he said, "who do preach the genuine Gospel, but to no effect. There is one exception in England—Mr. Walker, at Truro." And Walker, shortly after Wesley wrote these words, wrote to Adam of Winteringham concerning Vowler of St. Agnes, whose parish Wesley had troubled, "In their eye both Vowler and I are well-meaning legalists." Further, most of the Evangelicals foresaw very clearly the only possible result of Wesley's action, and did not wish to be compromised by a movement whose inevitable end was schism. The Evangelical clergy accepted and worked the parochial system without adding to it the elaborate outside organisation created by Wesley. They felt also more than the Methodists did the binding character of the Articles and the Prayer Book generally; and while the Methodists undoubtedly had the freer hand both as to teaching and as to organisation, yet the Evangelicals were, according to their light, the more loyal members of the Church to which in the first instance both parties belonged. The outside

Wesley and the Evangelicals.

world coupled the two together because of their numerous resemblances both positive and negative, but the outside world has never shown itself a capable critic even of the differences between various sections of the Christian Church. It should be premised further that the Evangelical revival was not an organised movement like the Methodist. The leaders knew, or came to know, each other, but there was no concerted action, no attempt, as it has been termed, "to organise an influence." This is the justification, and that it needs a justification is frankly admitted, for dealing rather with the work of individual men one by one than for treating of the movement as if it were a homogeneous whole. Its interest lies almost wholly in the individual leaders.

Among those who were connected with the Evangelical revival, the whole of the clerical career of James Hervey (1714-1758) comes within the limits of this chapter. He was a pupil of John Wesley at Lincoln College, and was one of the original Oxford Methodists. After serving various curacies, he succeeded his father in 1752 as incumbent of Weston Favell and Collingtree, and thus became a pluralist, but of the very humblest and most excusable kind; for the joint income of the two only amounted to £180 a year, and the joint population was exceedingly small. The works of this once admired writer, the *Meditations among the Tombs*, and *Reflections on a Flower Garden*, and the *Theron and Aspasio, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the Most Important Subjects*, have lost their savour,—the last named was the origin of the Sandemanian controversy on the nature of saving faith,—but his life has not. He was a pious, humble-minded Christian, a good parish priest, who never, so far as is known, acted in any way inconsistently with his position as a churchman; and it is refreshing to turn from his florid writings for the general public to the plain, simple sermons which he wisely wrote for his villagers. In both his object was, as he himself says, "to recommend his dear Redeemer," and if the style of his books suited the taste of his contemporaries, so much the better if the object was attained. Small as his professional income was, he devoted all the profits derived

James Hervey.

from his literary works, which must have been very considerable, to objects of Christian charity and benevolence.

The *Meditations* and *Reflections* were published by Richardson, the author of *Clarissa Harlowe*, in 1746, and produced a profit of £700. It was a small book, 216 pages 8vo, and took the form of two letters to a lady. The first part was intended to remind his readers of their latter end. The tomb of a young lady thus inspires the author: "Instead of the sweet and winning aspect, that wore perpetually an attractive smile, grins horribly a naked, ghastly skull. The eye that outshone the diamond's brilliancy, and glanced its lovely lightning into the most guarded heart—alas! where is it? Where shall we find the rolling sparkler?" The whole of this part is characterised by that morbid horror of death and that fondness for dwelling on the details of death-beds which were so marked and sad a feature of the Evangelical revival. No one can read the memoirs or the sermons of the chief persons concerned without being repelled by the long-drawn-out agonies or ecstasies, as the case may be, described in the one, or by the recitation of them for the edification of listening congregations by the other. Death was the end of all probation, the last act in the human drama, and nothing was spared to make the climax effective for good or for ill. It appealed to the popular imagination, and was one of the secrets of the success both of the Evangelical and Methodist preachers. It is enough to read George Whitefield's sermons or those of Berridge to see this, and to understand also how, under the influence of a strong magnetic personality and the equally powerful if concomitant influence of numbers, the physical phenomena described in a former chapter could be produced.

Hervey's *Meditations.*

Hervey himself, however, was not a great preacher in that sense. He was never physically strong, and his influence was almost wholly that of the pen. *The Reflections on a Flower Garden* form part of the same volume as the *Meditations*, and are cast in a lighter mould, though even here the exaggeration is very marked. He paraphrased Scripture in a manner happily all his own. Thus Psalm li. yields the following: "Though my conscience be more loathsome with adulterous impurity than the dunghill,

Hervey's *Reflections.*

though treachery and murder have rendered it even black as the gloom of hell, yet, washed in the fountain for sin and for uncleanness, I shall be, I say, not pure only—this were a disparagement to the efficacy of my Saviour's death—but I shall be fair as the lily, white as the rose. Nay, let me not derogate from the glorious object of my confidence; cleansed by this sovereign, sanctifying stream, I shall be *fairer* than the full-blown lily, whiter than the new-fallen snow." Can we wonder that Johnson ridiculed Hervey in his parody, *A Meditation on a Pudding*?

Yet it must not be forgotten that in the days when the beauties of Switzerland had not been discerned, and the world of nature was waiting for Wordsworth to interpret her towards the end of the century, Hervey was one of those who did see more than most of their contemporaries of that which is beautiful in the world around and in the starry heavens above, and in that way was one of the precursors of the "poetic interpretation of nature."

Ten years later, in 1755, after having in the meantime submitted most of the matter to the criticism of John Wesley, Lady Frances Shirley, and other friends, he published three volumes of *Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio.* *Theron and Aspasio.*
His purpose was to recommend "to people of elegant manners and polite accomplishments" the theology of John Calvin. No wonder that Wesley, as Hervey said, took him "very roundly to task, on the score of predestination," at which he confessed to being surprised, and this adverse criticism of Wesley led to permanent estrangement. Pupil though Hervey had been under Wesley as don, they met no more. The point on which the greatest divergence took place was Hervey's insistence on what he called "the imputed righteousness of Christ." It is best described in his own words. Theron has asked for further explication of terms, and especially of the terms "Christ's righteousness" and "imputed," and Aspasio replies: "By Christ's righteousness I understand all the various instances of His active and passive obedience; springing from the perfect holiness of His heart; continued through the whole progress of His life; and extending to the very last pang of His death. By the word *imputed*, I would signify that this righteousness, though

performed by our Lord, is placed to our account; is reckoned or adjudged by God as our own. Insomuch that we may plead it, and rely on it, for the pardon of our sins; for adoption into His family; and for the enjoyment of life eternal." Wesley's reply was simple and conclusive. "The imputed righteousness of Christ is a phrase not scriptural. It has done immense hurt. I have had abundant proof that the frequent use of this unnecessary phrase, instead of 'furthering men's progress in vital holiness,' has made men satisfied without any holiness at all; yea, and encouraged them to work all uncleanness with greediness." The work had an enormous circulation. The first edition consisted of nearly 6000 copies and the second of 4000, and within nine months a third edition was issued. It was Hervey's last great effort. For the latter part of his life he had been a chronic invalid, and on Christmas Day 1758 he died, aged only forty-five.

An exact contemporary of Hervey was Samuel Walker of Truro (1714-1761), who may be called a Methodist before Methodism and an Evangelical before Evangelicalism, but from first to last distinctly a churchman. His spiritual father was neither Wesley nor Whitefield, but George Conon, headmaster at the grammar school at Truro, whose influence was not brought to bear upon him until he had been in holy orders for at least ten years. His previous career had been that of the ordinary clergyman of the day. He was Devonshire born and bred, and proceeded from Exeter grammar school to Exeter College in 1731. He was therefore at Exeter College just at the time when at Lincoln College, next door, the Oxford Methodists were in the midst of their work. But he had no connexion with them in any way. Having graduated in 1736, he returned to his native county as curate of Doddiscombsleigh near Exeter, and served various cures until 1746, when he was appointed Rector of Truro and Vicar of Talland. Talland he resigned in 1752, having by that time conceived conscientious objections to plurality, and he is therefore always known as "Walker of Truro." But meanwhile he had conceived conscientious objections to many things besides pluralities. Up to 1747, that is, a year after he came to Truro, he had been, like numerous clergy of the time, perfectly moral and respectable,

Walker of Truro.

but rather easy-going and colourless in his views. Then, under the influence of Conon, he became far more strict in his life and far more definite in his opinions. He gave up all the amusements in which he had before indulged, devoted himself exclusively to the active work of his ministry, adopted similar sentiments to those of the Wesleys, but remained quite apart from both them and Whitefield. He created a great religious revival first at Truro, and then throughout the west of Cornwall, organised societies similar to those of Wesley, though more strictly guarded on Church lines, and became, in short, a sort of Apostle of Cornwall.

He took a deep interest in his brother clergy in the neighbourhood, whom he persuaded to assemble monthly to consult upon matters connected with their calling. John Wesley heard of his work and was much interested in it, and an intimacy sprang up between the two good men. But it was Wesley who used to consult Walker rather than Walker Wesley. It was soon found that there were differences between them, not so much in their opinions and their methods as in their attitude towards the Church. Walker, for instance, was not at all satisfied with Wesley's view that it was inexpedient to separate from the Church, but, like Charles Wesley, contended that it was absolutely unlawful. He also strongly disapproved of the power which John Wesley gave to his lay preachers, and wrote to Charles Wesley, who probably agreed with him, "It has been a great fault all along to have made the low people of your council." The relations between them became rather strained when Wesley persisted in establishing his societies in parishes where there were Evangelical incumbents, and Walker remonstrated with him, but in vain. Wesley, however, with characteristic generosity, always expressed the sincerest regard for Walker, and spoke of him as a better man than himself. Walker's influence was, of course, within a very limited sphere, and never extended over the vast area which Wesley's covered. But his career is singularly interesting, because within his limits he did that which John Wesley professed to do, and made his societies and other organisations truly handmaids to the Church and not rivals to it.

Walker and Wesley.

Let us now turn from Walker of Truro to Adam of Winter-

ingham. It was the custom of the eighteenth century, following, however, unconsciously a very much earlier fashion, to associate the names of clergymen with those of their parishes or places with which they were closely connected. Thomas Adam (1701-1784) was, it will be seen, considerably older than Walker, but the two were intimate friends and kindred spirits. "They were both," writes "Richardson of York," one of the editors of Adam's *Posthumous Works*, "true sons of the Church, and beheld with great anxiety those deviations of the Methodists from which they both suffered undeserved reproach, as we all do this day [1802], however regularly we conduct ourselves." Walker is chiefly known through his life, Adam through his writings. The life of Thomas Adam was singularly uneventful. He was born at Leeds, and educated at Leeds grammar school under Thomas Barnard, whose interest in Christian piety is shown by the fact that he was the biographer of the eminently pious Lady Betty Hastings. From Leeds he was removed to Wakefield, proceeded thence to Christ's College, Cambridge, but was very soon afterwards transferred to Hart Hall (Hertford College), Oxford. As early as 1724 he was presented to the living of Winteringham, a large village in a somewhat remote part of Lincolnshire, upon which he entered so soon as he was of canonical age, and there he remained until the end of his long life, that is, for the space of fifty-eight years. The living was only worth about £200 a year, and he was pressed both by his uncle, a man of some interest through whom he had received Winteringham, and also by the bishop of the diocese, Dr. Thomas, to seek further preferment, but he steadily refused, and remained from first to last simply "Adam of Winteringham."

Adam of Winteringham.

Like Walker, Adam does not appear to have imbibed his views from the Evangelical revival. There was no need that he should, for such views were, of course, prevalent long before that revival commenced, and we cannot trace any sudden change in him as we can in his friend Walker. He was apparently from first to last simply a quiet Evangelical clergyman, such as were his friend and near neighbour "Bassett of Glentworth," and his biographer "Stillingfleet of Hotham." His calm and blameless life, and his very name, would

probably have been forgotten but for a posthumous work which was never intended for publication at all, and was simply part of a priest's diary, which the Evangelicals always used carefully to keep. It was "given to the public in a convenient form" under the title of Adam's *Private Thoughts*, and was widely read and highly appreciated not only by Evangelicals but by men of far different views. Adam's ministerial life, which appears to have been consistent throughout, of course belongs both to the period preceding and also to that subsequent to that treated in this chapter, but it is convenient to notice him here on account of his connexion with Walker.

There are two other good clergymen who belong chiefly to this period, and are types of the Evangelical revival before the distinction between the Methodists proper and the Evangelicals proper was at all sharply drawn. These also are denominated from their parishes, being generally known as "Grimshaw of Haworth" and "Berridge of Everton." Except in regard of Christian piety, earnestness, and utter unselfishness, they differ about as widely as men could do from Walker and Adam. Both Grimshaw and Berridge were eccentric, sometimes almost to the verge of insanity, and if it were the object of this book to make people laugh, it would be easy to fill pages with their queer sayings and doings. But such matters hardly form part of Church history, and, moreover, it must be confessed that their sayings and doings are grotesque rather than amusing. Their form of wit was not of a very high order, and therefore from a literary as well as from an ecclesiastical point of view it will be better to dwell rather upon their piety, their earnestness, their self-denial, their activity, in all of which they equalled the best of those who were connected with the revival.

William Grimshaw (1708-1763) was born at Brindle in Lancashire, educated at the grammar schools of Blackburn and Hesketh, proceeded thence to Christ's College, Cambridge, received holy orders 1731, and was curate first of Rochdale and then of Todmorden. He lived a careless life till 1734, when he passed through a long spiritual trial, the death of his wife, whom he loved tenderly, being, it is thought, the turning-point in his career.

William Grimshaw.

The change in his views had no connexion with the Evangelical revival, which had not even then begun, but he was greatly influenced by the Puritan theology of the seventeenth century. He became a changed man before he left Todmorden, and when in 1742 he went to Haworth as perpetual curate, he entered upon his work there with all that fervour and activity which characterised the early Evangelicals. Haworth is a wild and desolate, and was then also a rough and lawless, village on the moors of the West Riding. In later times it has become celebrated as the home of the Brontë family. The effect which Grimshaw produced in his own parish was marvellous. He raised the number of communicants from twelve to nearly twelve hundred. He succeeded in putting a stop to the Haworth races, and also in bringing about a proper observance of the Lord's Day. He literally drove the people to church, going about with a horsewhip in his hand. He died a martyr to his work there, catching the illness which proved fatal to him from a sick parishioner whom he was visiting. But Haworth, large village as it was, did not afford sufficient scope for the energies of Grimshaw. Though he did not owe his conversion to the Evangelical revival, he heartily cast in his lot with it. The Wesleys, Whitefield, Venn, Romaine, and perhaps other leaders, used to preach in Haworth church, and he appears to have been particularly associated with the Wesleys, actually building for their societies what John Wesley would have called "a preaching house" within a stone's throw of the parish church.

The Calvinistic Controversy had not reached its acute stage in Grimshaw's time; so although he was a Calvinist whilst Wesley was an Arminian, this difference did not at all interrupt the amicable relations between them. Of Wesley's system of itinerancy he heartily approved, and became a most active itinerant himself, both in his own neighbourhood and other parts of Yorkshire, and also in Cheshire and Lancashire. He also founded societies after Wesley's model. He had no scruple about intruding into other men's parishes, whether the parish priests liked it or not; and being a beneficed clergyman in the diocese of York, he could be more easily called to account than John Wesley, who had no benefice, could. So he was summoned to explain his irregular

conduct before the archbishop, probably Dr. John Gilbert, who seems to have treated him kindly on the whole, and to have sympathised with his self-denying earnestness, though, of course, he could not altogether approve of his irregularities. It is not quite clear before what archbishop Grimshaw was summoned. But Archbishop Drummond, who succeeded Gilbert in 1761, said to Dr. Conyers Middleton, "Were you to inculcate the morality of Socrates it would do more good than canting about the new birth." It is probable, therefore, that Drummond would have reproved Grimshaw, whereas it is reported that the archbishop said, after hearing him, "Would there were many good men like you!" Grimshaw kept up his oddity to the end, crying on his death-bed, "Here goes an unprofitable servant."

John Berridge (1716-1793) was in many respects like Grimshaw, as earnest, as active, as self-denying, and it must be added as eccentric, in his words at least if not in his deeds. He also, during the period which this chapter embraces, but not subsequently, kept up the most friendly relations with John Wesley, and his church at Everton was even more connected with the Wesleys' labours than Grimshaw's was at Haworth. Indeed, it was at Everton church that those physical phenomena which attended the preaching of Wesley and Berridge were most painfully conspicuous. Men, women, and children fell down as dead, some sinking in silence, others with extreme noise and violent agitation. Many wept without any noise. Some, especially young girls, went into a form of trance. After a while, however, these abnormal manifestations ceased at Everton, and Berridge's ministry became quiet and more settled in its methods. But Berridge had to make a greater sacrifice when he turned "Methodist" than Grimshaw had; for he had a considerable university reputation, and was altogether a more cultured and notable man. He was the son of a wealthy farmer at Kingston in Nottinghamshire, and having graduated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, in 1738, was elected to a fellowship there. He remained a resident fellow at Cambridge for many years, serving the curacy of Stapleford for the last six of them, viz. from 1749 to 1755, when he accepted the college living of Everton in Bedfordshire, and

John Berridge.

there he remained for thirty-eight years, till his death in 1793. There also he was buried, and his epitaph, composed by himself, may be read to this day. It has been truly said that this curious document contains an epitome of his life. He described himself as an itinerant servant of Jesus Christ, who loved His Master and His work, and after running on His errands many years, was called up to wait on Him above. It then summarises his religious crises, and is a very characteristic example of the Evangelical way of looking at the religious life. There is no mention of Baptism or Confirmation as marking actual steps, but all is concentrated upon the consciousness of saving grace and the necessity of being born again. The epitaph begins with the query, "Reader, art thou born again? There is no salvation without a new birth." Berridge's writings are full of humour and good sense, and are well worth reading.

Berridge himself does not date his full conversion until 1755, the year he went to Everton. But while he was still at Cambridge he was so far regarded as belonging to "the new lights" as to give considerable offence. Like Grimshaw, he became an active itinerant and was as well known in Bedfordshire and the Midlands in that capacity as Grimshaw was in the North. The part which he unhappily took in the Calvinistic Controversy belongs to a later time than that with which this period deals. It was unworthy of the man intellectually no less than morally; for he was certainly a man of considerable intellectual power and much reading, and his disposition was kindly and simple until it was soured by the *odium theologicum*.

The men hitherto described lived in the country. But the Evangelical movement was not without its representatives in London. Romaine was another good clergyman whose public life belongs alike to the present period and to that which is to follow. He was, in fact, one of the most prominent of all the Evangelicals during both. Like Berridge also, he had a university reputation to sacrifice when he joined what Hannah More afterwards called the "calumniated party." Both he and Berridge showed a moral courage which, from the nature of the case, those who made a similar sacrifice earlier or later could not.

William Romaine.

When the Wesleys began their career at Oxford, Methodism was not invented as a term of reproach. When Isaac Milner joined the movement at Cambridge it had become a power. But when Romaine did so at Oxford and Berridge at Cambridge, obloquy was at its height, and the power which the movement was to develop had not yet asserted itself. In other respects, always excepting the piety and self-denial which were common to both, Romaine was the very opposite of Berridge, as a sketch of his career and character will abundantly show.

William Romaine (1714-1795) was, as his name implies, of French extraction, his father having been one of the many French Protestants who came over to England at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He was born at Hartlepool, educated at the school founded by Bernard Gilpin at Houghton-le-Spring, proceeded thence to Hart Hall, Oxford, in 1731, and migrated to Christ Church, whence he graduated in 1734. He was ordained in 1736, held country curacies till 1748, when he settled in London, and remained there until the end of his long life. Up to the time of his coming to London there is not much to be said about him, except that he had a reputation at Oxford for learning, at any rate in his own college, when only a deacon. He was early engaged in controversy with Warburton, who called him, in his violent way, an "execrable scoundrel," and accused him of making an unfair use of an answer to a friendly letter on the subject of the *Divine Legation*. The correspondence between the giant and the stripling was printed in 1739 in the *History of the Works of the Learned*. Romaine also preached two university sermons at Oxford in 1739 and 1741 respectively against the great Colossus, and it was perhaps in reference to this dispute among other things that Romaine described many years later "a very, very vain young man" who was probably himself. But he was also an able and learned young man, perhaps the ablest and most learned of all the early Evangelicals. The subject of Romaine's controversy with Warburton was that of the supposed silence of the Old Testament in regard to a future state. About the time that the university sermon was preached (1739) Romaine wrote a flattering letter to Warburton, representing himself as a

young student desirous of further instruction, thanking him for his most excellent work, and relating sundry criticisms upon it which he had heard in the company of several clergymen. He further represented himself as defending Warburton, but as unable to answer the queries put to him, which accordingly he sends to the author of the *Divine Legation*, with a request for help thereon if ever an idle half-hour should lie on his hands.

Warburton did not know and could not discover who "W. Romaine" was, and wrote a brief civil answer in which he said that a necessary part of his argument was to show that the Jewish patriarchs, fathers, and prophets, had a knowledge of a future state and an expectation of redemption. Very shortly afterwards Romaine's sermon was published, and then Warburton saw that the alleged objections on the part of the clergymen were in reality Romaine's own objections, which he had stated in advance to Warburton so that they might not seem to come from himself but from others. It was this which excited Warburton's indignation. Romaine in his reply evaded the main point, but on the other hand claimed, and rightly, that Warburton had in his letter to him practically recanted his whole thesis. The Old Testament did contain the hope of a future life and of Messianic redemption. When and how he first identified himself with the Evangelical party are not very clear, but from 1749 onwards he was not only an advocate but a confessor for the cause. In 1748 he was appointed lecturer at the united parishes of St. George's, Botolph Lane, and St. Botolph's, Bishopgate; in 1749 to a double lectureship at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West; and in 1753 morning preacher at St. George's, Hanover Square. When he changed the City for the west end his troubles began. At St. George's, Hanover Square, there was then, of course, a fashionable congregation, and it strongly objected to the church being crowded with poor people, who were attracted thither by Romaine's preaching, and at the request of the vicar he resigned the lectureship. But the same thing happened at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, in Fleet Street. The poor were attracted by him to that church also. The parishioners had to force their way to

Controversy with Warburton.

London ministry.

their pews through "a ragged unsavoury multitude." The rector took the most effectual means of preventing Romaine from occupying the pulpit by sitting in it himself.

A trial in the King's Bench ensued, and Romaine was deprived of one of his lectureships at St. Dunstan's, which was supported by voluntary contributions, but continued in the other, which was endowed with the magnificent stipend of £18 a year, and the use of the church was granted to him at 7 P.M. The churchwardens, however, were equal to the occasion. They refused to open the church a moment before seven, and then would not light it. So Romaine had often to preach in the dark, holding a single taper in his hand! This disgraceful state of things went on until on one occasion the Bishop of London, Dr. Terrick, who happened to precede him in the pulpit, observed the closed doors and put a stop to the persecution. But the poor man was still driven from pillar to post. His own university refused him the pulpit of St. Mary's, and the hostility of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster drove him from a preachership at a chapel of ease to St. Margaret's, Westminster. It would only weary the reader to specify the various lectureships and preacherships which Romaine held. His happiest time must have been when he was preaching in the kitchen and drawing-room of Lady Huntingdon, who made him her chaplain. His later triumphs belong to the next chapter. His first twelve years in London have been dwelt upon because they are curiously illustrative of the time when the Church had reached low-water mark. Perhaps Romaine was not a very genial, conciliatory man: perhaps his foreign extraction may have been a hindrance to his understanding English ways; but he was absolutely without reproach; his abilities and attainments much above the average; his earnestness and piety, his orthodoxy and loyalty to the Church unquestioned. The chief objection against him was that he succeeded in doing what good Church people of all types are longing to see done. He drew the poor to church, and mainly for this grave offence he suffered annoyance which amounted to persecution. In 1760, when this chapter ends, he was left stranded at the mature age of forty-six in precarious posts, which were quite unworthy of his merits.

Hostility to Romaine.

Like all great movements, the Evangelical revival found its strength in its positive aspects. The doctrines that were preached were stated plainly and without qualification. The preachers appealed to the common people, and did not trouble themselves with the reservations and modifications that a more scholarly audience would expect to hear. The early Evangelicals of whom mention has been made in this chapter were not thorough-going Calvinists, though in the main their teaching was permeated by Genevan doctrines. They insisted upon the total depravity of human nature. The image of God was not only defaced but effaced by the Fall. Restoration to Divine favour was effected by Christ not only on behalf of man, but instead of man, who of his own will had no power to turn himself Godward. All salvation came absolutely from the free, unmerited grace and mercy of God, which mercy was appropriated by the instrument of faith. Faith was to be exercised consciously by every man, and the moment of this consciousness was defined as that of conversion or regeneration. The distinction between these terms does not appear till very much later. Man being accounted righteous before God, needed further to be made righteous or holy, and so the teaching of the necessity of sanctification followed that of justification. Man had within himself the witness of the Spirit that he was saved, and the daily presence of the Spirit inspiring his thoughts and guiding his life and leading him into all truth. The ultimate source of truth was to be found in Holy Scripture (which meant to them the narrower Canon, for of the Apocrypha they knew little and slighted it), in the verbal inspiration of which they most fully believed.

Strength of the Evangelicals.

The language in which all this was expressed was for the most part that of Scripture itself, and of Scripture interpreted in a very loose manner. Every word being of equal value and every word being equally applicable to every man, passages and phrases were torn from their contexts and applied in a manner which went beyond even the tropological mysticism of some of the early Fathers. This was bound to lead to a certain amount of unreality and to a constant repetition of pet phrases, the use of which became a sign of Evangelical

orthodoxy. The people expected to hear the truth of the Gospel expounded in one particular manner, and any deviation from it was regarded with suspicion. Hence the formulae became hardened in process of time and lost whatever they originally had of vitality. This was shown not only in the sermons but also in the hymns. Many of these were morbid in their expression of individual sinfulness on the one hand and of rapture on the other, and hence their almost total disappearance from modern hymn-books. They are, moreover, expressions of individual experience and feeling, and are, therefore, unfit for congregational use. Few of the *Olney Hymns* are now sung, and even if they were printed nowadays they would not be chosen for public use.

This morbidity is especially true of the way in which death and all its attendant paraphernalia were regarded and spoken of. It was the golden age of the funeral sermon, and a most trying function it was. There was extravagant expenditure upon the outward semblance of grief. The officiating minister generally wore across his breast deacon-wise a broad scarf of rich silk, which was frequently afterwards made into a silk gown for his wife or daughter. The family attended in full force and listened as best they could to the eulogium pronounced upon their dead. It was not considered decent to dispense with such formalities, and elaborate provision was made for their due performance long beforehand. Grimshaw's earlier will contains the following: "To attend my funeral I desire that 20 persons be invited (of my next relations and intimatest acquaintance) and intertained in the following manner: — Let 5 quarts of claret (which will be every one a gill) be put into a punch-bowl and drunk in wine-glasses round till done. Let every one have a penny roll of bread to eat therewith; let every one be come and let all sit down together to the same as an emblem of Christian love. This at home. Let every one have a quart of ale, a 2 penny spiced cake, and afterwards, immediately before rising up, a glass of claret and a paper of biskit (4 papers to the pound); distribute the biskits first, then the wine. This at the drinking-house. And as I've by will ordered 5 pounds to bury me with, it will be disburs'd in the following manner, viz.—To a funeral

sermon, 10s. 6d. To church dues, 5s. To a horse-litter, £1 : 1s. To a coffin, £1. To 2 gallons of claret, 6s. 8d. per gal., 5 qts. at home, 3 qts. at drinking-house. To 20 2 penny cakes, 3s. 4d. To 20 penny rolls, 1s. 8d. To 25 pr. gloves, £1. To expence of inviting to funeral, 3s. To parson and clerk each a penny cake and other odd(ments?), 2s. 2d. Total, £5." This was drawn up in 1739, about three weeks after his wife's funeral, and represents therefore the ideas of that period. It is interesting to compare it with his later and modified instructions which were carried out at his own funeral in 1763. He would have only a plain poor man's burial-suit, a plain poor man's coffin, of alder boards only, with the words on the cover of it "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." There was to be a plain dinner, consisting of only two dishes and tarts and cheese. Each attendant (of whom there were to be twenty, "religious or relative friends, or both") was to have afterwards a pair of black gloves and a burial cake, and to be twice served with warm negus. Psalms and hymns were to be sung on the way to Luddenden, where he was to be buried. After the dinner there was to be a service, and half a guinea was to be given for the sermon. So that there are here evident traces of a growing wish to avoid the evils which too often attended funeral rites in country places.

In London and in many provincial towns the lectureships attached to the churches were largely held by Evangelicals. Many of these had been founded in Puritan times, and being in the gift of the parishioners, and in most cases independent of the incumbents, were held by men whose churchmanship was not of a pronounced type. The system worked both for good and evil. It attracted men to the Church whose special gift lay in preaching, but it also rendered possible a conflict of opinion between the incumbent and the lecturer, which was not productive of good in the parish. In London most of the churches had a lecturer attached to them, and many eminent men belonging to all parties held them from time to time. The names of Tillotson and Burnet, Fleetwood, Blackhall, Willis, Hoadly, Herring, may be cited on the Whig side, and those of Sharp and Atterbury, Wake, Stanhope,

Lectureships.

Bennet, Moss, and Marshall on that of the Tories. Some of them, such as the Golden Lecture, were of considerable value. At St. Margaret's, Lothbury, this was worth until the recent scheme of the City Parochial Charities Act Commissioners at least £400 a year. Others, such as that of St. Lawrence Jewry, were of more honour than profit. In some cases, such as for example that of St. Antholin, provision was made for a daily lecture, and the position was limited to the holders of poor livings in Islington. For the greater part of the period covered by this volume these lectures were well attended and influential, but towards the close of the century, although the lecturers still held their places, yet the number of hearers fell off, partly through the increase in the numbers of the parochial clergy, and partly through the transference of population, which was even then beginning, from the City to the suburbs, and the consequent building of new churches in the new districts thus created. They lingered on indeed until almost the close of the nineteenth century, when most of them were swept away, or their tenure considerably modified and their emoluments reduced, under the City Parochial Charities Act.

AUTHORITIES.—William Law's mystical writings have not yet received the attention they deserve both historically and theologically. But see the Introduction to Dr. Alexander Whyte's *Law's Characters and Characteristics*, W. R. Inge's Bampton Lectures on *Christian Mysticism*, and Eleanor C. Gregory's admirable Introduction to her *Little Book of Heavenly Wisdom*. James Hervey's *Meditations*, etc., 1803 ed., contains a *Life of the Author*. Overton's *The Evangelical Revival*, Bishop J. C. Ryle's *Christian Leaders of the Last Century*, and M. Seeley's *The Later Evangelical Fathers* may all be studied with advantage. The *Life of William Grimshaw*, by R. Spence Hardy, 1861, and the authorities there cited, should be noted, as also the complete edition of Thomas Berridge's *Works*, with Memoir, and the Rev. W. B. Cadogan's *Life of Romaine*. The *Dict. Nat. Biog.* deals with most of those named in this chapter.

THIRD PERIOD, 1760–1789

CHAPTER XI

WARBURTON, HURD, AND LOWTH

It must be confessed that it is only when seen through a very strong microscope, so to speak, that the state of the Church in the early days of George III. shows any signs of improvement. Indeed, even then they are only discernible when read in the light of after events. In themselves the times seemed to be, and perhaps were, as bad as ever. Bishops were still appointed for social or political, or at best intellectual, reasons, and not because they were most fitted for the post of presiding over the practical and spiritual work of the Church. Preferment-hunting was still a favourite pursuit of the clergy from the highest to the lowest. Immediately upon a vacancy occurring, and sometimes before it occurred, men wrote to those in power advancing their own claims to the preferment. The Duke of Newcastle was the recipient of many requests of this kind. Thus, the Archbishop of Tuam, Josiah Hort, writes to him upon the death of the Archbishop of Armagh, John Hoadly: "The death of our late primate happening while I was at Tuam, which is near 100 miles from Dublin, I am later than others in my application upon that event; but as the race is not to the swift, especially in cases of this nature, I hope it will not be too late for me to lay my small pretensions (if I may be permitted to use that expression) before your Grace.

General Church tone.

Preferment-hunting.

. . . I need not observe to your Grace what my principles and complexion were in the worst of times, and that I have not warped from them in one instance to this day." For the same primacy the Archbishop of Dublin also made suit to the minister. He had heard it rumoured that the Bishop of Derry was likely to be appointed, as he actually was, although junior to himself; and adds that while he "will give place to an experienced English prelate," he thinks it a shame that a junior should be put over him, as that would make him appear insignificant in the world and render him useless hereafter. So again, upon the death of the Bishop of Ely, Zachary Pearce, good man though he was, writes to Newcastle that the filling of that see will, he thinks, make a vacancy in one of the English bishoprics now held by a bishop educated at Cambridge. In that case Pearce, who had just been appointed to Bangor, begs that he may be recommended to the King for such vacant bishopric, instead of having his election to Bangor confirmed. When the living of St. James's, Westminster, was vacant, Newcastle writes to the Bishop of London on behalf of the King: "It is not his Majesty's intention to recommend any particular person to your lordship for it, but his Majesty would be extremely sorry to see a vacancy made by himself supplied by any person on whom his Majesty could not depend"; which Newcastle further explains in a postscript to mean, that the living must be given to a good Whig, a zealous and practicable man, and concludes with the words, "Don't be angry."

Perhaps the most inveterate of all the clerical beggars was Sir William Ashburnham, Dean of Chichester. He writes to Newcastle that "the exceeding unpleasantness of his situation, occasioned merely by the streightness of his circumstances, compels him to write for anything the vacancy caused by filling up the bishopric of Hereford may afford," and candidly adds that the thing in the world which would make him most happy would be to get the deanery of St. Paul's. Later he says that the vacancy of two bishoprics must needs give the duke "an opportunity of doing whatever he really intends to do for him." He tries to secure the appointment of a residentiary of St. Paul's, and succeeds in 1754 in obtaining the bishopric of Chichester. Not content, he again applies

for promotion upon the deaths of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, and having in the meanwhile failed to obtain the bishopric of Salisbury, he in 1762 hopes that if the Bishop of London's death creates a vacancy, then he may at last be appointed. Dr. Thomas Newton (not to be confounded with John Newton) writes to the Duke of Newcastle in August 1761: "I think it my duty to acquaint your Grace that the Archbishop of York lies a-dying, and, as all here think, cannot possibly live beyond to-morrow morning, if so long: upon this occasion of two vacancies, I beg, I hope, I trust your Grace's kindness and goodness will be shown to one who has long solicited your favour." It is, however, only fair to add that the Church as thus depicted was neither better nor worse than the society of the time. Place-hunting was rife everywhere both in Church and State.

Pluralities, with their necessary concomitants of non-residence and consequent neglect of duty—a few men gorged, the majority starved—were as common as ever. Morals seemed as corrupt, amusements as brutal, punishments as cruel, church services as sparse and unattractive, new organisations for doing good as rare, and the old ones, started in happier days, as badly supported, as they had been in the days of the two first Georges. The efforts of the new reformers of the Evangelical revival only brought out into stronger relief the general corruption, for instead of being welcomed, they were thwarted and snubbed at every turn.

Nevertheless, there certainly were, to those who could look beneath the surface, symptoms of a turn of the tide. Warburton, writing to Hurd in 1771, animadverts on some remarks of Voltaire written five years earlier, and says: "The state of religion amongst us, though it be bad enough amongst us, is not so bad as this scoundrel represents it. Miserable as the condition of it is at present, I am confident it will revive again; but as I am no prophet, but only a sincere believer, I will not pretend to say how soon. The present generation seems not to be worthy of this blessing, which believers only are indulged with a Pisgah sight of—just sufficient to support their faith, not sufficient to prevent their being laughed at by the prodigal, and even by the sceptical." And Bishop Newton, speaking of "the gross

Signs of improvement.

immorality and irreligion of our people," yet adds that there were "still some vital signs, some symptoms of recovery." It counted for something, if not for very much, that the highest personages in the nation were now on the side of virtue and religion. The purification of the Court had led, in a certain measure, to a gradual purification in less exalted quarters. The fashion was set of paying at least an outward respect for decency, and people are apt to follow the fashion of those above them.

The Evangelicals, in spite of opposition and discouragement, increased both in numbers and influence. Compare their position in 1760 and 1790, and the difference will be very perceptible. Moreover, what was perhaps of still greater importance, they influenced indirectly men who were better theologians, and of a stronger intellectual calibre generally, than themselves. The year 1760, again, was "the turning-point in the history of Methodism in its relations to the Church. It was at this time that the lay preachers employed under the Wesleys began to take out licenses as dissenting teachers for themselves and their chapels, and to administer the Sacraments." But these points will best be brought out by entering into details, and we will begin, as in duty bound, with the rulers of the Church, though we shall find that these do not form so interesting a study as those noticed in former chapters. We shall find no such men as Gibson, Sherlock, Butler, Benson, or Wilson.

At the accession of George III. Secker was Primate of All England. He had attained that eminence two years earlier, and held it for eight years of the new reign. No subject could have been brought more into contact with his sovereign than Secker seems to have been with George III. He had baptized him in 1738, crowned him in 1760, married him in the same year, and he subsequently baptized several of his children. But his ill-health in later years prevented him from having the influence which, as Archbishop of Canterbury, he deserved to have. For he was certainly the most distinguished of all the primates from the death of Archbishop Wake to the close of the century. It is true that he was less consulted than any archbishop had been for a long time before; and in his later years

Archbishop Secker.

he suffered greatly from a painful disease which at last caused his death, so that it is not surprising that his primacy was uneventful. As the limits of this work only admit of notice of those prelates who were really powers, Secker's successors cannot be fully described, nor yet his brother primates of York. Suffice it to say that one was the son of a baron and the other, Drummond of York, of an earl, and according to eighteenth-century notions these would not be bad reasons for their appointment.

Archbishop Cornwallis.

One or two words, however, must be said about Cornwallis, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1768 to 1783, whose tenure of the see led to scandal. He was essentially a man of the world. He improved Lambeth Palace, kept a hospitable and elegant table, was easy of access and a friend of toleration both towards Roman Catholics and dissenters. The hospitality of the palace, however, brought down upon him the censure of many right-minded people. Mrs. Cornwallis was recognised in the world of her day as one of its fashionable leaders, "who eclipsed everybody by the splendour and magnificence of her equipages and entertainments"; she had given several large balls and convivial routs at the Palace, and had drawn forth satirical observations even from some of the gay world. Lady Huntingdon was impelled to seek a private audience of the King on the subject, and George III. wrote the archbishop a severe reprimand. "I hold these levities and vain dissipations as utterly inexpedient, if not unlawful, to pass in a residence for many centuries devoted to divine studies, religious retirement, and the extensive exercise of charity and benevolence—a place where so many of your predecessors have led their lives in such sanctity as has thrown lustre on the pure religion they professed and adorned. I trust you will suppress them immediately, so that I may not have occasion to show any further marks of my displeasure or to interpose in a different manner."

The first bishop who was consecrated in the year that George III. came to the throne was the famous William Warburton; and perhaps an apology is due to the memory of so distinguished a man for keeping him so long waiting, for he was a prominent churchman for many years before that. But the blame must rest with those in authority, who did not

make him a bishop until he had passed the allotted age of man. William Warburton (1698-1779) represents in an exaggerated form the leading characteristics of the Church of the eighteenth century. It was not lacking in learning, and Warburton, whatever else he was, was certainly a learned man; indeed, there were few, if any, men of his time whose knowledge extended over so wide a range. A certain robustness and manliness of thought and style were also among the merits of the epoch, and Warburton possessed these qualities to such an excess that he became overbearing and rude. The Church was, too, in an exceptional degree in touch with the secular life of the period, and Warburton was so to such an extent that he sometimes seems hardly fit to be a clergyman, much less a bishop. It combined the odd mixture of great laxity of practice with the very straitest and most inelastic theory, and this too was almost caricatured in Warburton. Without the slightest imputation of any sort upon his morals, it must be owned that he was a very free-and-easy liver, but if any one diverged one hair's-breadth from the narrow rut in which Warburton's thoughts moved, he condemned him without benefit of clergy. All free-thinkers were, of course, his natural prey, and he felt it his peculiar office to hunt down that "pestilent herd of libertine scribblers out of England as good King Edgar did his wolves." William Warburton.

He was equally hostile to those who erred in a different direction. William Law and the Mystics, John Wesley and the Methodists, though the two classes had little in common, are lumped together in one common condemnation. For they were both enthusiasts, and enthusiasm was his special abhorrence. His treatise on *The Doctrine of Grace* "is directed chiefly against Methodism, but also against William Law, whom he describes as its original parent, and Zinzendorf, its early nurse. All forms of enthusiasm were to his mind a viperous brood, which a champion of sober reason should feel bound at once to crush." Papists and all who were papistically inclined came in for his abuse; and in this he was ably seconded by Bishop Lavington of Exeter, who had published in 1747 a work against the Methodists, *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared.* But the most strictly orthodox churchmen were by no means safe; for it

was not sufficient to agree with Warburton's conclusions unless you also agreed with every stage of the argument by which he arrived at those conclusions. Bishop Lowth, for example, was certainly neither a freethinker nor an enthusiast nor a papist, but he did not agree with all the paradoxical statements of the *Divine Legation*, and therefore no one was more fiercely assaulted than he. In this case, to use a homely phrase, Warburton "got as good as he gave," for Lowth in his reply is as abusive as Warburton, though in a more refined way. It was not an edifying spectacle to see two Church dignitaries trying, as Dr. Johnson put it, "which could call names best";[1] but Lowth's answer is certainly an amusing as well as an extremely able piece of satire. Warburton delivered the swashing blow of the bludgeon; Lowth the clear-cut thrust of the rapier.

Another very curious combination in the middle of the eighteenth century was an almost morbid despair about the corruption of the times, joined with a self-complacent satisfaction with the working of the Church system as it then was. We have seen one instance of this combination in Secker, but it appears in an exaggerated form in Warburton. He frequently laments to his friend Hurd the evil days on which his lot had fallen. But the Church was not to blame. It was doing all that could possibly be expected of it. Its arrangements were perfect. Its relations to the State were adjusted with the greatest nicety. The Church surrendered to the State its independence and authority, while it was protected and supported by the legislature. The State selected for alliance on great questions of policy the strongest religion, and would change it for another if that religion did not maintain its supremacy. Other societies should have toleration, but not so as to injure the established religion; and to guard against this danger the Test Law was sufficient. An Act of Indemnity might be passed year by year to make its provisions innocuous, but it must be held in reserve in case its enforcement became necessary. "Thus," he exclaims

Warburton's optimism.

[1] "Johnson answered in reply to George III: 'Warburton has most general, most scholastic learning; Lowth is the more correct scholar. I do not know which of them calls names best.'" But Johnson had a very high opinion of Warburton's powers. Cf. the *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*.

with delightful self-complacency, "I have defended the justice and equity of our happy Establishment," and so forth. Deists, Methodists, Mystics, Jacobites, Non-Jurors, and such like among their other misdemeanours were all for disturbing this "happy Establishment." And therefore, for this as well as for other reasons, war to the knife must be waged against them.

In another respect Warburton was an exaggerated specimen of the mind of the eighteenth century, which was essentially an age of reason. Reason was the faculty to which it appealed. Of a more spiritual faculty than mind it took little account; the emotional element in human nature was all but ignored. No one took this line so thoroughly, not to say boisterously, as Warburton. He put his famous argument in the *Divine Legation* into syllogistic form, and prided himself that he had "proved as demonstrably as a mathematical problem" his apparently paradoxical theory. No wonder that neither could he appreciate the Methodists nor the Methodists him. They were at cross purposes. He was thinking of the head; they were thinking of the heart. As Jones of Nayland racily expressed it, "The Methodists thought as little of the bishop's Christianity as the bishop thought of the Methodists' learning." No wonder also that he was in collision with one whose intellectual powers were at least equal to his own—William Law, who writes more in sorrow than in anger of Warburton's utter want of spirituality. But it was not want of religion. Those who accuse him of that mistake the man. He was sincere enough according to his light, but there was a whole range of thought beyond him, and beyond the ken of the typical mind of the eighteenth century.

His intellectualism.

As an extreme specimen of a prevalent habit of mind and life, justice has hardly been done to him either as a man or as a writer. As a man there is nothing worse to be said against him than that he was blustering and overbearing, with a not very lofty but truly sincere conception of the nature and obligations of Christianity. As a writer he was shrewd and forcible, and displayed an enormous amount of multifarious learning, but spoiled it all by a lavish use of strong language against his opponents. That, however, was

common enough at the time when he wrote, though not so blatant elsewhere as with him. The *Divine Legation of Moses*, *The Alliance of Church and State*, and *The Doctrine of Grace* are now, perhaps deservedly, obsolete; but they are the writings of a man who had not only immense learning and great keenness, but also an honest intention to enforce what he believed to be the truth. They were ridiculously overrated once. They have now suffered from the law of reaction and are rated below their worth. His weakness as well as his strength is not badly described by the term "Colossus," which was often applied to him. A Colossus is defined as "a statue of enormous magnitude, an image greatly beyond the life." This would apply metaphorically to the *Divine Legation*, an account of which will be found in an earlier chapter. The book, in spite of its vast proportions, is still, it must be remembered, only a fragment, for it was never finished. Perhaps if the epithet be added which describes the Colossus at Rhodes as "a great brazen statue," the description will not be inappropriate to the writer whose mind is reflected in his work. It was colossal; but to many people a Colossus, though a huge and imposing, is not an attractive, object.

His writings.

Warburton's natural defects were probably encouraged by his circumstances. He was the son of a solicitor who was town-clerk of Newark, and in 1706, when he was only eight years old, he lost his father, who left behind him a widow and some daughters, and only one surviving son. An only boy with a widowed mother and three sisters is, if he has any tendency that way, liable to grow up with domineering habits, and Warburton's education was not likely to correct the tendency. He went to school at Newark and at Oakham, where he did not distinguish himself, and was then articled to a solicitor at Markham, where he remained five years. He there developed an omnivorous appetite for miscellaneous reading. Whether he ever practised as a solicitor is uncertain, but he very soon determined to turn from the legal to the clerical profession, not apparently because he felt any call to holy orders, but because it was the "more learned" profession; and because, in those easy-going days, he knew that he should have more leisure for his favourite pursuit.

Education.

Having received holy orders in 1723 from the Archbishop of York, in whose diocese Nottingham then was, he found a kind patron in Sir Robert Sutton, whose family was then, as now, influential in the neighbourhood of Newark. By him he was presented in 1727 to the living of Greasley, and in 1728 to the more valuable one of Brant Broughton near Newark. With Brant Broughton he continued to hold Greasley until 1730, when he was presented by the Duke of Newcastle, another great neighbour, to the living of Finsby, in the marshes of Lincoln, which he held, without ever residing, until 1756. He settled down at Brant Broughton, his mother and sisters, to whom he was uniformly kind, residing with him, and perhaps encouraging his domineering propensities.

Warburton never went through the discipline of a college life, though the influence of his ever-kind friend Sir Robert Sutton led the University of Cambridge to give him the degree of M.A. in 1728, on the occasion of the new King, George II.'s, visit. He richly deserved the distinction, for he was an indefatigable student, and in the quiet of his country cure, the duties of which could not be burdensome, laid up an enormous store of knowledge. He would sit up reading the greater part of the night, which made his fond sisters fear that he would injure his health by excessive study. His connexion with Concanen, Theobald, and other minor literary characters does not bear upon our subject, except that that too would be likely to foster his besetment, for he was obviously the king of his company. It was at Brant Broughton that he wrote *The Alliance between Church and State* (1736), *The Divine Legation of Moses* (Books i. ii. iii. 1737; iv. v. vi. 1741; and a fragment of Part iii.). It is not necessary to dwell upon the rest of his career and writings: the innumerable answers he wrote to different attacks upon the *Divine Legation*, both to the main thesis and to various collateral topics; or his curious and interesting relation to Pope, which belongs to literary rather than to ecclesiastical history; or his rivalry with Bolingbroke in the friendship of the great poet; or his connexion with the excellent Ralph Allen of Prior Park, and this through his marriage with Allen's niece; or his memorable friendship with Hurd. His various preferments, which were certainly less rather than greater than might be expected

considering his eminence, culminated in his tardy appointment in 1760 to the poor see of Gloucester, which he held for nearly twenty years without making any particular mark there. Indeed, he was hardly fit to be a bishop, at any rate according to the standard which we now take of a bishop's life and work, and even in those easy-going days he does not appear to have been quite at home in his dignified post, and sometimes shocked his more precise friend, Hurd, by his unepiscopal ways. Nevertheless, he added a great name to the episcopate—a name that was thought much greater then than it is thought now; and beyond his abusive language, there is nothing to be said against him, though he was not so mighty a champion of the Church as he thought himself to be. It is not because he was a truly great churchman, but because he was a characteristic specimen of the peculiar type of the eighteenth century, and because he made so large a figure for praise and blame in the Church of his day, that it has been thought necessary to devote so much space to this strange being, who could never have been exactly what he was in any era but the Georgian. He is nevertheless worthy to be remembered as the munificent founder of the Warburtonian Lectures.

Bishop of Gloucester.

Two other bishops connected with Warburton, Bishop Hurd and Bishop Lowth, are typical prelates of the period, and each therefore requires a brief notice here. Richard Hurd (1720-1808) rose from a comparatively humble position without any influential friends except those of his own making. He also had the somewhat invidious honour of being the King's favourite prelate. This should be taken into account in estimating the very depreciatory remarks which have been made about him both by his contemporaries and by modern writers. That he was an accomplished scholar and an eminently respectable man in every relation of life is undeniable. He did not rise with a bound, but passed decently through the various gradations until, at the mature age of sixty-three, he reached the highest step, which he wisely declined to ascend. He was the son of a Staffordshire farmer, and having been educated at Brewood grammar school, proceeded as "a poor scholar" to Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he was in due time

Richard Hurd.

(1742) elected Fellow. That was the proper position for him, for he retained till the end of his life the characteristic features of a university don of the more cultured type. In 1749 he published an edition of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, in the Preface of which he paid a compliment to Warburton, which attracted the attention of the great "Colossus." Hence arose a lifelong friendship which supplies a notable instance of the attraction of opposites; for never were two men, to all appearance, more unlike. Warburton was boisterous, unconventional, outspoken to a fault; Hurd prim and conventional, cautious and reserved. Warburton was a vigorous and original writer, and a rather inaccurate scholar, with a mass of ill-digested learning. Hurd's scholarship was his strong point. Perhaps the friendship was cemented by the fact that one possessed what the other lacked; the one was the complement of the other.

Nevertheless, Hurd did not stand to Warburton as Boswell to Johnson, or Byrom to Law; nor, to make a more appropriate comparison in dealing with a classical scholar, did he play the part of the *fidus Achates* to Warburton's Aeneas. He thought far too much of his position for any such humble part as that; and Warburton, instead of snubbing him, as Johnson snubbed Boswell, and Law snubbed John Byrom, is perpetually paying him the most elaborate and overstrained compliments. The correspondence between Warburton and Hurd, which gives us one of the most vivid pictures we possess of the mind of a typical English churchman of the eighteenth century, is conducted on perfectly equal terms—in fact, more so than we should expect, considering that Hurd was in the first instance indebted to Warburton for his rise. It was through Warburton that, in 1750, he became Whitehall Preacher; in 1762 sinecure Rector of Folkton, in Yorkshire; in 1765 Preacher at Lincoln's Inn; and in 1767 Archdeacon of Gloucester, where his faithful friend was bishop. In 1775 he was made Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry on the recommendation of Lord Mansfield. This introduced him to the King, who was pleased with his courtly manner, and in 1776 appointed him preceptor to his two elder sons, the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York. He was thus brought into close connexion with royalty, and George III. soon learned to consult and trust him

more than any other bishop; while Hurd, on his part, had evidently a hearty respect, and indeed affection, for the King. In 1781 he was translated to the see of Worcester, and finally, in 1783, having, as we have seen, gone through the intermediate stages, he was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury, which he declined. He remained at Worcester to the end of his long life, twenty-five years later.

Bishop of Worcester.

It is unnecessary to quote either the praise or blame, both of which were lavished upon Hurd in superabundance. It is sufficient to take his own works and the facts as they stand; and the point that strikes us most forcibly is the utter hopelessness that Hurd, any more than Warburton, could in any way sympathise with that most important religious movement which was going on and was spreading rapidly during the whole of his long episcopate. When Warburton published his *Doctrine of Grace* against the Methodists, Hurd thought it was "the singular merit of this discourse that it will be read when the sect that gave occasion to it is forgotten; or rather, the sect will find in it a sort of immortality"—a saying which "may take a high place in the long list of unfulfilled predictions." At the Assizes, of all inappropriate occasions, in 1752, he chose for the subject of his Assize sermon the singularly incongruous one of "The Mischief of Enthusiasm and Bigotry," in which he descanted upon "the exhorbitance of ungoverned piety," "this turbulence of ungoverned zeal, this rash infringement of the regular institutions which have been provided for the maintenance of religion and the preservation of public tranquillity"—as if Methodism were the reason why there was need of any Assizes at all. He adds, however: "one cannot but admire such earnest, at the same time that one pities and condemns such groundless and ill-directed zeal"; and then shows what a blessing it might be "under the guidance of well-interpreted Scripture and sober piety." To him "enthusiasm" in any form was especially odious. A life of dignified seclusion and learned ease was his ideal. If we compare such a life with that of John Wesley or of the Evangelicals within the Church, of whose growing power he seemed to be totally unconscious, we shall understand how great was the gulf between them.

Robert Lowth (1710-1787) was a different man from either

of the two last mentioned. If his learning was not of so wide a range as Warburton's, he could make a more effective use of it; and his dignity was not so apt as Hurd's to degenerate into primness and formality. Robert Lowth.

As a bishop he was more "to the manner born," for both his father and great-grandfather, whom he could well remember, had been distinguished clergymen. He was more distinguished than either of them, though his father is said to have been the better scholar. He also received the best of education, first at Winchester and then at New College, Oxford. He paid a pious tribute to Winchester and New College by writing a *Life of William of Wykeham* (1758), which was the standard work on the subject until quite recently. In 1741 he was appointed Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and the lectures on Hebrew Poetry, *Praelectiones de Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum*, given in that capacity are equally conspicuous for the elegance of their Latinity and the value of their matter. In 1750 Bishop Hoadly appointed him Archdeacon of Winchester, upon which he vacated his fellowship at New College; in 1753 he was collated to the rectory of Woodbury; and in 1766 was raised to the Bench as Bishop of St. David's, and translated the same year to Oxford. In 1777 he became Bishop of London, Dean of the Chapels Royal, and a Privy Councillor; and in 1783 was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury, on the recommendation of Bishop Hurd, who had, as we have seen, declined it, as also did Bishop Lowth, on the ground of failing health.

Lowth remained Bishop of London until his death in 1787. Among his writings perhaps the most valuable is his *New Translation of Isaiah, with Notes* (1778), which passed into an eleventh edition in 1835. His strong poetic feeling eminently qualified him for such a task: he was not without the divine gift himself, though he produced no great poem. As a controversialist he was a very formidable opponent, as we have already indicated in the account of his dispute with Warburton. His polished sarcasm is all the more telling because of the severe self-restraint which he strove to exercise. Perhaps, on the whole, he was the most highly cultured prelate of his day, and his culture helped to give him a wider sympathy than many of his

brethren possessed. The old story of his interview with John Wesley will bear repeating once more. In 1777, just after Lowth had been made Bishop of London, Wesley met him at dinner. The bishop refused to sit above him at table, saying, "Mr. Wesley, may I be found sitting at your feet in another world"; and when Wesley refused to take the precedence, Lowth insisted upon it, saying "that he was deaf and desired not to lose a sentence of Mr. Wesley's conversation." Wesley highly appreciated the courtesy, and wrote in his Journal: "Dined with Lowth, Bishop of London. His whole behaviour worthy of a Christian bishop—easy, affable, and courteous—and yet all his conversation spoke the dignity which was suitable to his character." It has been objected that the bishop's conduct on this occasion was affected and constrained, but those who think thus hardly understand what Wesley was. He identified himself so much with the poor and illiterate, that people are apt to forget that he was a man of a very high class in every way, not inferior—in point of education, breeding, and culture, in anything, in short, except that he was not a bishop—to Lowth; while he was seven years his senior, and in point of self-denial and Christian activity much his superior, as Lowth himself would be the first to own.

Lowth and Wesley.

This is not a history of bishops, and therefore it is not necessary to notice any more except in so far as their names will occur incidentally in connexion with other subjects, especially as more will have to be noticed when we come to our last period, some of whom were bishops now, but did not come into prominence until then.

AUTHORITIES.—It is only needful to add to those already cited *The Correspondence of Warburton with Hurd*, 1809; *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Bishop Hurd*, by Francis Kilvert; Lowth's *Letter to Warburton*, and the *Life of Warburton* by John Selby Watson, 1863.

CHAPTER XII

THE EVANGELICAL CLERGY

By the beginning of the reign of George III. the Evangelical movement was gradually making its way within the Church of England, following the lines of George Whitefield and Lady Huntingdon rather than those of the Wesleys. It may seem strange that it should have done so; for both John and Charles Wesley were assuredly more attached churchmen than either George Whitefield or Lady Huntingdon. But a variety of circumstances brought about the result. In the first place, Lady Huntingdon, from her high position, was able to throw the aegis of her protection over the clergy who worked with her. She availed herself of her right as a peeress to appoint as many chaplains as she pleased; and several of the early leaders of the Evangelicals held that post. Then, in the two points which had been bones of contention between John Wesley and Whitefield for twenty years, the rising Evangelicals took the side of Whitefield.

This brings us to the famous Calvinistic dispute, which had been simmering ever since Whitefield was in America in 1739-40. There it simply took the form of a correspondence between Wesley and Whitefield, the gist of which has been wittily and not unfairly summed up thus: "DEAR GEORGE—I have read what you have written on the subject of predestination, and God has taught me to see that you are wrong and that I am right.—Yours affectionately, J. WESLEY." And the reply: "DEAR JOHN—I have read what you have written on the subject

The Calvinistic Controversy.

of predestination, and God has taught me that I am right and you are wrong.—Yours affectionately, G. WHITEFIELD." It did not, however, burst out in all its force till 1771, when Whitefield was no more; but meanwhile most of the Evangelical clergy and the laity who followed them were, more or less, on Whitefield's side. Not only two points, but all the five points of what is called the "Quinquarticular Controversy" were indeed at issue. The following, however, were virtually the two questions on which the whole controversy hinged: Are a certain number predestined to eternal life? Is it possible to attain sinless perfection in this life? Of these questions Whitefield and the Calvinists answered the first in the affirmative, the latter in the negative. Wesley and the Arminians answered the first in the negative, the second in the affirmative. Both parties were very positive. Both discussed the questions as matters of life and death; but it may be added that both toned down their ideas, to say the very least. The moderate Calvinism of a rather later time had no tendency to Antinomianism, and John Wesley materially modified his views on perfection. His later theory might much more correctly be called "Christian perfection," which allows for the infirmities of human nature, than "sinless perfection"; indeed the former is his own designation of it, the latter that of his opponents. Guarded, as Wesley guarded it, it is perhaps a wholesome and inspiring doctrine, and one which leads not to self-righteousness, but to exactly the opposite result, as is finely expressed in the last stanzas of Charles Wesley's noble hymn attached to his brother's equally noble sermon on Christian Perfection:

> Now let me gain perfection's height!
> Now let me into nothing fall!
> Be less than nothing in my sight,
> And feel that Christ is all in all.

Finally, the irregularities of Wesley and his followers, especially in the matter of intruding into parishes which were held by Evangelical clergy, not unnaturally inclined Evangelical churchmen to the other side.

Among the Evangelical clergy at the beginning of the

reign of George III. the first to be noticed must be William Romaine, whom we left at the end of a former chapter tossed about from lectureship to lectureship in a most uncomfortable way, though finding some little comfort in being one of Lady Huntingdon's chaplains. At last, in 1766, when he had reached the mature age of fifty-two, he found himself in an assured position, but not without considerable difficulty and much opposition. The living of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, with St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, which was in the gift of the parishioners, became vacant in 1764, and Romaine offered himself as a candidate for it. It raises our indignation that such a man at such an age should have to put himself in such a position. He was elected, but the poll was disputed, and it was not until 1766 that the Court of Chancery confirmed his right to the benefice. This was a highly important epoch in the history of the revival, which received from the appointment of Romaine to St. Anne's its first *point d'appui* in London. For twenty-nine years, that is, for the rest of his life, he ministered with eminent success at St. Anne's. He attracted the masses to the church, as he had done at St. George's, Hanover Square, and at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West. At St. Anne's happily there were no adverse churchwardens or incumbents to interfere with him. On his first Good Friday he had five hundred communicants, and on the following Easter Day three hundred. The church became so crowded that a gallery had to be built.

William Romaine.

The success of Romaine's ministry shows how ripe people must have been for a revival, for he does not appear to have had any popular gifts to recommend him. He was a grave, austere, reserved man, a strict disciplinarian, and one more calculated to inspire awe than love. His *Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith* is undoubtedly a strong book, perhaps the strongest that the Evangelical revival produced, but we can hardly fancy it a popular work, nor the writer of it a popular preacher or speaker. His Calvinism was of a more pronounced type than that of any of the Evangelicals, and we can well believe the truth of John Newton's admission to Wilberforce that "Romaine had made many Antinomians." Probably, too, Thomas Scott had Romaine in his mind

when he spoke of "great names sanctioning Antinomianism," for Romaine's was the greatest name among the early Evangelicals. Not that he had the slightest tendency to Antinomianism himself. A more blameless life was never led, and his Calvinism did not lead him, as it led too many, into any breach of Christian charity. John Wesley, when complaining to Lady Huntingdon in 1763 of the hard treatment he had met with from some of her friends, adds, "Only Mr. Romaine has shown a truly sympathising spirit, and acted the part of a brother"; and Romaine himself, writing from London to the same lady at Brighton, says, "Things are not here as at Brighthelmstone; Foundry, Tabernacle, Lock, Meeting, yea, and St. Dunstan's itself [his own church], has each its own party, and brotherly love is almost lost in our disputes. Thank God, I am out of them." Romaine was Lady Huntingdon's senior chaplain, and her chief adviser and assistant on all occasions. It was no less truly than beautifully said of him that "he lived more with God than with men; and in order to know his real history, or the best part of it, it would be requisite to know what passed between God and his own soul." The same writer says of him that he "knew by experience what it was to live by faith, to walk by faith, and to triumph in faith." This does not agree with Warburton's estimate of him, "Never was there a more execrable scoundrel"; but then Romaine wrote against Warburton, and so committed the unpardonable sin.

We left John Berridge a staunch ally of John Wesley, gladly and frequently lending his pulpit to the great evangelist. The Calvinistic Controversy divided the friends. Berridge, like Wesley, had once been an Arminian, but he changed his opinions and supported his new views with all the vehemence, not to say violence, of a convert. It would be unprofitable to quote the abusive language, both in prose and doggerel verse, with which he now assailed his old friend. It was unworthy of one who had been a distinguished member of his university, and still more unworthy of a pious parish priest, as Berridge undoubtedly was. But the change is noteworthy as illustrating how the parochial clergy drifted away from Methodism to

John Berridge.

Evangelicalism. Berridge too, like Romaine, was a chaplain to Lady Huntingdon, but he saw clearly how both her "Connexion" and Wesley's "Societies" were bound to drift away from the Church. His words are worth remembering, for they are true prophecy of what happened.[1]

Separation of Methodists and Evangelicals.

As the Calvinistic Controversy was perhaps more than anything else the cause which led to the parting of the ways between the Wesleyan Methodists and the Evangelicals proper, it may be well to say at once all that needs be said upon this ungrateful subject. It is one in which neither party showed itself at its best. The good men on both sides, and especially on the Calvinistic side, in their very earnestness for what they believed to be the truth, forgot for a while the rules of Christian charity, nay, of common courtesy, and it must be confessed that in this respect John Berridge was a sad offender. Not, however, quite so grievous a one as Augustus Toplady (1740-1778), who was as much the ablest writer on the Calvinistic side as John Fletcher was on the Arminian. Indeed, the only two works which from a theological point of view deserve to be noticed at all in a short history of the time are Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism*, written in defence of the Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference of 1770, and Toplady's *The Historic Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England*, published in 1774. Lady Huntingdon characterised the former as "Popery unmasked," and tried to rally round her all "real Protestants" to protest against its doctrine. Both are books which deserve serious attention. Fletcher writes with great raciness and humour, and in the Christian tone and spirit which we would naturally expect from so saintly a man. His style is pure and graceful, and he takes a much broader view, notably on the question of the salvation of the heathen who have lived up to their light, than was at all usual in the narrow eighteenth century. Not that he agreed with the view of the Freethinkers that they might be saved through the light of nature, "for he allows no such light," but that the merits of Christ might be effectual for those who had never heard of Him, which is

Toplady and Fletcher.

[1] They are quoted on p. 76. See the whole passage in *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, ii. 423.

sound theology. Wesley might well be delighted with and proud of such an ally.

Toplady's *Historic Proof* is even more powerful. Taking, as the Evangelicals did, the Church of England as a Church which was virtually founded at the Reformation, he seems to prove his point up to the hilt. This indeed is not the common opinion regarding the book; but it is hard to maintain that the English divines of the sixteenth century, and many also of the seventeenth, did not favour Calvinism. In his other works on the same subject, especially those which deal with John Wesley, Toplady spoils all by his abusiveness. He was particularly exasperated because Wesley had handed him over to his "understrappers," as he calls them, especially "Thomas Olivers, the cobbler," and he passes all bounds in his vituperation of his rather contemptible adversary. But this part of his writings does not give a true picture of the man, who, like most of the Evangelicals, was an earnest, active parish priest as Vicar of Broad Hembury, where he wore himself out prematurely in his Master's service, and died at the early age of thirty-eight. To do justice to him we must turn from Toplady the controversialist, the railer at John Wesley, to the author of "Rock of Ages," and to the undoubtedly well-read and able historian.

Happily in course of time the inscrutable questions involved in the Calvinistic Controversy became less and less prominent, and the Evangelical leaders decidedly discouraged the discussion of them. When Henry Venn, for example, was asked whether a certain young minister was a Calvinist or an Arminian, he replied, "I really do not know; he is a sincere disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that is of infinitely more importance than his being a disciple of Calvin or Arminius." When Thomas Scott, again, in his pre-Evangelical days, was by his own showing rather a conceited young man, he tried to entrap John Newton, who was more than twenty years his senior, into the discussion, but Newton gently evaded the trap; and when Scott, grown older and wiser, himself became an Evangelical leader, he warned his hearers, as his printed sermons abundantly show over and over again, against falling either into Calvinistic or Arminian pitfalls. Their weaker followers were naturally irrepressible in the matter, for

it seems to be a general law in theology, that the weaker a person is the more profound are the questions he loves to discuss, and the more confident he is in his opinions about them. In this sketch, at any rate, it will be better to follow the stronger leaders rather than the weaker followers. So we may dismiss without a sigh the Calvinistic Controversy, and turn to the more congenial and profitable task of considering the lives and labours of those good men most but not all of whom were indeed moderate Calvinists, but who did not let their Calvinism interfere with their practical work.

Henry Venn

And the first who comes before us, certainly in date, perhaps also in importance, is Henry Venn (1725-1797), who held deservedly a very high place among the early Evangelicals. Like Hervey and Romaine, he was a link between the earlier and later phases of the movement. For he was an intimate friend, and for a time a coadjutor, of the Wesleys and Whitefield, and he remained a chaplain of Lady Huntingdon until the secession of 1781. But he became more and more identified with the Evangelical as distinguished from the Methodist section of the revival, and to this section he undoubtedly belongs. He was the youngest son of a rather distinguished High churchman, Richard Venn, Rector of St. Antholin's in the City of London, and a friend of Gibson, Bishop of London; while his mother was a daughter of the celebrated John Ashton of Penketh in Lancashire, the Jacobite, who had been Clerk of the Closet to Mary Beatrix, Queen of James II. The family account derived from his daughter describes him as "privy purse to James II.": his relations were evidently more with the Queen than the King. Ashton was hanged in 1691 for complicity in Lord Preston's plot.

Mrs. Venn was god-daughter of the Queen, and named Mary Beatrix (her full name was Maria Ann Isabella Margaretta Beatrix) after her. Henry Venn was ordained deacon on June 14, 1747, by Bishop Gibson of London, on his title as B.A., from the respect which the bishop had for his father's memory; he was elected a Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1749; and in 1750 became a curate to Adam Langley, who held the livings of St. Matthew, Friday Street, in the City, and West Horsely in Surrey. Venn was literally curate

to the vicar, for he served in both parishes until 1754. It was during those years, when the Evangelical revival was first beginning to be felt, that he embraced its principles, which were, of course, different from those in which he had been brought up. Then he became curate of Clapham, and held at the same time at least three lecturerships in the City. He formed a close friendship with John Thornton, who lived on the Common, and his connexion with Clapham tended no doubt greatly to strengthen his new views. In 1759 he was appointed Vicar of Huddersfield, and for twelve eventful years did yeoman's service in that important commercial centre. In fact, Huddersfield, under Venn, was the first large town outside of London in which Evangelicalism, apart from Methodism, took root; and there, as a natural consequence, was one of the first instances of the parting of the ways between the two sections of the movement; for the question arose, If the parish priest inculcated its principles, was there any need for Mr. Wesley's preachers? The same question had arisen in regard to Truro under Samuel Walker, but it came more to the front at Huddersfield, because a large town in the West Riding was more prominent than a smaller one in remote Cornwall. A fairly amicable compromise was arranged on the basis that the itinerants should come to Huddersfield once a month; but there were certainly strained relations between John Wesley and Henry Venn, the exact position of either being not in that early stage clearly defined.

Huddersfield.

Henry Venn, indeed, illustrated in his own person the transition period in which he lived. In the early part of his Evangelical career he used to itinerate after the fashion of the Wesleys and Whitefield, and as parish priests like Grimshaw and Berridge were wont to do. But he subsequently changed both his mind and his practice. "Induced," writes his son and editor, in his most interesting biography, "by the hope of doing good, my father in certain instances preached in unconsecrated places. But having acknowledged this, it becomes my pleasing duty to state that he was no advocate for irregularity in others; that when he afterwards considered it in its different bearings and connexions, he lamented that he had given way to it, and restrained

several other persons from such acts by the most cogent arguments." It may be noted that the writer was a leading Evangelical of the next generation, and his hearty approval of his father's change from irregularity to regularity is interesting as illustrative of the course into which the Evangelicals finally settled. Venn's incessant labours at Huddersfield wore him out before his time, and at the early age of forty-seven he was obliged to seek rest in the quiet little village of Yelling near his own university. There he still helped forward the Evangelical cause. The proximity of Yelling to Cambridge enabled young university men who afterwards became pillars of Evangelicalism, such as Charles Simeon, William Farish, and Joseph Jowett, to be in constant communication with him, much to their own profit, both as regards faith and practice. Charles Simeon speaks with rapture of a visit he paid to Yelling under the conduct of John Venn, who introduced him to "his own dear and honoured father, Henry Venn, and oh!" he exclaimed, "what an acquisition was this! In this aged minister I found a father, an instructor, and a most bright example; and I shall have reason to adore my God to all eternity for the benefit of his acquaintance."

Yelling.

A little before his death Henry Venn returned to his old home at Clapham, where John Venn, the worthy son of a worthy father, was rector. And here it may be noticed that Henry Venn, unlike many of the Evangelicals, lived again, so far as his principles are concerned, in his children and grandchildren, to the third and fourth generation. If this work were not limited to the eighteenth century, it would be easy to specify numerous descendants bearing the honoured name of Venn and holding substantially the same principles as those held by Henry Venn. As a devotional writer Venn is known by his *Complete Duty of Man.* It is an earnest, sensible, and eminently readable compendium of the churchman's principles and duties from the Evangelical point of view. Without actually traversing the principles of the famous *Whole Duty of Man,* which was once regarded as next, and only next, to the Bible and Prayer Book, in point of value, Venn undoubtedly intended his book as a sort of supplement

Complete Duty of Man.

and correction to the earlier work. This was a much wiser course to take than that which Whitefield, Cowper, and several Methodists took. Instead of abusing the old manual as they did, Venn supplied people with what he thought a better. Both have now almost fallen into the limbo of oblivion, though the *Whole Duty* was reprinted not long ago; but all who consult Henry Venn's book must admit that he did what he intended to do faithfully and well, and that without any want of good taste or delicacy of feeling, which cannot be said of some of the depreciators of the *Whole Duty*.

John Newton (1725-1807), next in point of date among the Evangelical leaders, forms about as marked a contrast, except in earnest piety, to Henry Venn as could well be conceived. Venn's father was a noted clergyman. Newton's, a master mariner in the merchant service. Venn's mother was a strong churchwoman, who must at least have had great sympathy with the Non-Jurors, if she were not one herself. Newton's was quite at the opposite pole, being a pious dissenter, and from her Newton derived his earliest religious impressions, which in his lowest degradation he never entirely lost. Venn was brought up as we should expect a clergyman of the best type to be; in the natural order of things received holy orders, and was from first to last eminently respectable. Newton can scarcely be said to have been brought up at all, never dreamed of going to a university, would never have been thought likely to become a clergyman, outraged all propriety, and, if we are to believe his own account of himself, sank to the lowest depths of degradation. In fact, he was the only one of the early Evangelical leaders who could, in the literal sense, sympathise with the open and notorious sinner yearning for a better life, inasmuch as he had gone through the same experience himself. He lost his mother when he was only seven years old, and with her lost the chief influence over him for good, for his father speedily married again and acquired new interests.

John Newton.

After only two or three years' schooling at Stratford in Essex, he went to sea at the tender age of eleven, and made six voyages with his father before the latter retired from sea in

1742. Then he went thoroughly wrong; became a midshipman on board a king's ship, deserted, was recaptured and reduced to a common seaman; he exchanged into a slave-ship and became the servant to a slave-trader, and he had some share in the guilt, if not in the profit, of the slave business. If his own lucid *Narrative* may be taken literally —and there is no reason to doubt but that it may—he was before his conversion in 1748 an open blasphemer, a debauchee, and a seducer of others, though not a drunkard, in fact, sunk in the lowest depths of iniquity; though all the while there were slight lucid intervals, when his mother's lessons came home; and throughout he preserved a pure and devoted attachment to Mary Catlett, with whom he had fallen in love when she was only fourteen and he seventeen. He had to work out his own salvation with little or no human help, though his father never lost sight of him, and in the end was the means of his being brought home. No other friendly hand was outstretched to help the poor outcast except the hand of God, and when at last he became a changed man and a devoted parish priest, he might say in very truth with the Apostle, "By the grace of God I am what I am." It is not necessary to dwell upon the details of his wonderful change, and still less upon the iron determination by which, without any early advantages or any later help, he managed to acquire a competent knowledge of Latin, some smattering of Greek and Hebrew and even Syriac, to make some progress in mathematics, to write scholarly English, and to gain at least as much knowledge of theology and ecclesiastical history as falls to the lot of the average clergyman. In 1750 he married Mary Catlett, in 1755 settled at Liverpool as a custom-house officer, was introduced into the Evangelical circle, became an enthusiastic disciple of Whitefield, a friend of Wesley, and an acquaintance of Grimshaw, Berridge, Venn, and Romaine.

It need scarcely be said that his Church views were not very definite, and though he determined to become a minister of Christ, he hesitated for some time between the Church of England and the Independents. Indeed, he was at first in difficulty about taking orders in the Church of England. But, he says, "reasons increased upon me which not only

satisfied me that I might conform without sin, but that the preference was plainly on that side." The reasons which prevailed were (i.) the parochial system, and (ii.) the greater freedom of its ministers. "I have from the first preached my sentiments with the greatest freedom. I have always acted in the parishes which I served according to my own judgment, and I have done some things which have not the sanction of general custom. But I have never met with the smallest check, interference, or mark of displeasure from any of my superiors in the Church to this hour." He was also impressed with the variety of thought in the Church, and spoke with high appreciation, mingled with some criticism, of her Liturgy. He says, referring to the same subject in a letter to Lord Dartmouth (May 22, 1759): "At that time I was under some scruples and difficulties about Episcopal ordination, but in an occasional, or rather providential, conversation with the Rev. Mr. Crook of Hunslet, near Leeds, these were so far removed, that I determined to apply. Not long after Mr. Crook wanted a curate, and I accepted a title from him which was the very first that came to my knowledge." He solicited ordination from Archbishop Gilbert, and was met with a flat refusal without cause assigned. The archbishop's letter was cold and formal. He simply referred to Newton's employment at Liverpool, and says that he "thinks it best for you [Newton] to continue in that station which Providence has placed you in," and therefore desires to be excused admitting him into holy orders. Newton apparently learned from Crook that the mere fact of the title being at Hunslet, and therefore under Crook, who was obnoxious to the archbishop, was in itself sufficient to account for this harsh refusal, and he further conjectures that his own willingness to sacrifice a life appointment worth £100 a year for an uncertain curacy of £30 to £40, instead of being considered as in his favour, was regarded as a mark of unsound judgment.

Newton and the Church.

He then made application to the Bishop of Chester in a very straightforward and manly letter. After referring to his studies as having in the first instance been undertaken for no reason beyond that of his own private improvement, and to

the persuasion of friends as insensibly engaging his thoughts to the ministry, he appeals to the bishop. "It was not without much deliberation that I entered on my present views, and I have gone too far, lightly to recede. The affair is become public, and even the reversion of my place secured. . . . I protest in the most solemn manner that my intentions are upright and peaceable. I seek neither preferment nor popularity; I neither am nor have been in connexion with any party, nor do I intend it"; and he concludes by asking for an opportunity of justifying himself in the case of adverse representations being made to the bishop. The bishop replied through the Archdeacon of Chester that, whatever his own sentiments might be, the archbishop's refusal had absolutely tied up his hands from attending to his application. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that he took charge for a few months of an Independent congregation. Finally, in 1764, he was successful in receiving holy orders from Dr. Green, Bishop of Lincoln, who, he says, was most courteous and candid. It was probably at the instance of Lord Dartmouth, to whom he was introduced, and to whom Newton, though an utter stranger, had written, in the first instance in 1759, asking for his advice and help, and of Dr. Haweis, who in this year (1764) edited his *Authentic Narrative*, that Bishop Green consented to ordain Newton, though in point of attainments there was no need of any favour, for by this time Newton had made himself fully equal, if not more than equal, to the clerical standard. Through Lord Dartmouth he obtained the curacy of Olney, a living in that nobleman's patronage, then held by Moses Browne, another Evangelical. Browne, who had thirteen children, was forced by pecuniary difficulties to accept the chaplaincy of Morden College, and so was non-resident at Olney; and at Olney Newton remained for sixteen years, with the miserable stipend of £60 a year, labouring most conscientiously and diligently on an ungrateful soil.

Newton's earnestness, however, impressed the Olney people. The church became so crowded that, with the approbation and assistance of Lord Dartmouth, a gallery was built, which till a few years ago was still standing and still known as "Newton's gallery." At Olney Newton formed his noted

friendship with William Cowper, which will be noticed when we come to speak of the poet. The munificent John Thornton of Clapham gave him a stated allowance of £200 a year at Olney, with a permission to draw more if necessary; and the small town, or large village, of Olney became a great Evangelical centre. Newton used to hold prayer-meetings in conjunction with dissenting ministers, with one of whom, named William Bull, he formed an intimate friendship. He used also to hold what would now be called "cottage lectures" both at Olney and in the neighbourhood. He certainly did not lose opportunities for doing good. He preached always on the evening of the fair-days, calling it *more suo* opening his booth, though his method of winning attention does not seem very likely to succeed. "Sometimes," he says, writing to Lord Dartmouth on June 29, 1774, "I depreciate the wares and objects of the fair, and endeavour to convince them that all is vanity and vexation of spirit in comparison to what is set forth to view and to sale, without money or price, in the ordinances of the Gospel; but, alas! I have the fewest spectators and the fewest buyers." Again on July 1, 1775, he writes, referring to the outbreak of war in the American colonies: "When we received the news of the late hostilities in the neighbourhood of Boston, I immediately proposed a meeting for prayer extraordinary on a national account; it is on Tuesday mornings at five o'clock, when we have from 100 to 150 people assemble"; and then suggests a day of public humiliation enjoined by authority. So he spared no pains; but, in spite of his great activity and earnestness, it may be doubted whether his ministry at Olney was a success. He made his mark, as such a man was bound to do, and under him all the people at Olney who thought about religion at all became religious; but if his successor, Thomas Scott's account be true, they were not in a satisfactory state, and Newton was far from satisfied with them. Trouble arose during the short time that Newton's immediate successor was there. The people were full rather of the knowledge that puffeth up than of the love that edifieth, and their religion was not of a sufficiently practical character. At least such was Scott's opinion.

Olney.

Olney has been immortalised by the fact that it was

there that Newton published the *Olney Hymns* in 1779; the *Olney Sermons* in 1767; the *Review of Ecclesiastical History*, which suggested to Milner his *History of the Church of Christ*, in 1770; the *Letters of Omicron* in 1774; and finally the *Cardiphonia*, which was written before he left Olney, though not published till 1781. He was by no means comfortable at Olney, and in 1780 gladly accepted the benefice of St. Mary Woolnoth with St. Mary Woolchurch, Lombard Street, to which he was presented by his faithful friend John Thornton, and there he lived for the rest of his life, that is, for twenty-seven years. In 1781 he published his *Letters to a Nobleman*, that is, to Lord Dartmouth, rightly entitled *Cardiphonia*, for they are in very truth the voice of his heart, and these letters are perhaps the most valuable of all his works. In 1790 he lost his wife, to whom he was deeply attached to the very end as he had idolised her when she was a child, and after she was gone he still treasured her memory. Year after year, on the anniversary of her death, he wrote a copy of verses containing a most touching tribute to her, though not perhaps of a very high poetical order, and he published in 1793 a volume entitled *Letters to a Wife*, which some think in bad taste, though they are characteristic of the loving and lovable character of the man. Of his sermons the most curious and interesting are the fifty on the *Scriptural Passages sung in Handel's Oratorio "The Messiah,"* published in 1786. He has been much ridiculed for undertaking a crusade against the oratorio; and certainly he has not carried the popular verdict with him in his objections to that form of sacred concert. But the objections were thoroughly in accordance with the tone and spirit of the Evangelical revival; and putting aside a few passages which are rather narrow and uncharitable, the sermons may still answer a wholesome purpose in calling attention to the solemn words, when there is perhaps a tendency to think only of the music for which they are compiled.

St. Mary Woolnoth.

Altogether, John Newton seems to have been a man to whom scant justice has been done. He was far indeed from being the hard, gloomy, imperious, narrow-minded bigot that he has sometimes been represented. Under a somewhat rugged exterior there was as tender and loving a heart as

ever beat in human frame; and the gentleness, forbearance, and Christian charity which marked his dealings with Thomas Scott, and, in spite of the popular opinion to the contrary, it may be added, with William Cowper, are most remarkable. If we consider the circumstances of his early life, his intellectual attainments and achievements will seem perfectly wonderful. As a hymn-writer he was not perhaps great. Yet it can scarcely be denied that he wrote some very good among a greater number of very indifferent hymns. His sermons are full of matter and good sense, and as a letter-writer he is unique in his way. He himself thought that it was the Lord's will that he should do most good by his correspondence. There is unquestionably a tinge of melancholy about all Newton's writings, arising not so much from his Calvinism, which like Venn's was very moderate, but from a sense of the moral abyss from which he had been rescued, and a fear of ingratitude for his extraordinary deliverance. But this same feeling made him invaluable as a spiritual adviser to those who desired to rise from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness; and it was in this capacity more than in any other that he did service to the Christian Church. Cowper, Hannah More, and William Wilberforce took him for their spiritual director. He was, in fact, the spiritual adviser, almost the confessor, of most of the lay Evangelicals, and it was as the friend of the leaders rather than as a leader himself that he made his mark.

Character.

His favourite maxim was the hackneyed line *Haud ignara mali miseris succurrere disco*, but it had a more than ordinary significance in the mouth of one who had passed through so terrible an ordeal as Newton had. It is not at all inconsistent with the sense of dejection which pervades all his sayings and writings, that he had also a strong sense of humour, and his humour was of a far higher order than that of his brother Evangelicals, Grimshaw and Berridge, while its brightness was enhanced rather than dimmed by the somewhat dark setting in which it often appeared. Two specimens may be given. Some self-satisfied young clergyman read his three delightful Letters on *Grace and the Blade, A*; *Grace and the Ear, B*; and *Grace and the Full Corn, C*, and

wrote to Newton that he read his own character accurately drawn in *C* (full maturity); to which Newton quietly replied that he had forgotten to add till now one prominent feature in *C's* character, viz. "that *C* never knew his own face." When he left Olney he wrote the following no less humorous than useful letter to Scott, his successor in the study at Olney. "Methinks I see you sitting in my old corner in the study. I will warn you of one thing. That room (do not start) used to be haunted. I cannot say I ever saw or heard anything with my bodily organs, but I have been sure there were evil spirits in it and very near me—a spirit of folly, a spirit of indolence, a spirit of unbelief, and many others—indeed their name is legion. But why should I say they are in your study, when they followed me to London and still pester me here?" As it is particularly desired to be fair all round, it is necessary to add that Newton even more than most of the early Evangelicals was but little of a churchman. It was only by a kind of accident that he became a clergyman; in almost all essential points he might as well have been, say, an Independent minister, as he once contemplated; and it is therefore not wonderful that the result of his labours at Olney was to strengthen the dissenters rather than the Church, and that to this day the interest in him at Olney is with dissenters rather than with the Church.

From John Newton we pass, by a natural transition, to his son in the faith, his successor at Olney, and one who in many respects, both personal and circumstantial, curiously resembled him. Thomas Scott (1747-1821) was, like Newton, one of the last men we would have expected to become an Evangelical leader. The first twenty-five years of his life were, in a different sort of way, quite as unpromising as those of Newton. He was the younger son of a grazier at Brayloft, in the Lincolnshire Marshes, and having received an imperfect education, was apprenticed to a surgeon at Alford, a little town a few miles off, but in two months was discharged for misconduct. His father then gave him menial work on the farm, and treated him so harshly that he ran away from home, and attempted in vain to obtain holy orders—a fact which suggests that bishops were not

Thomas Scott.

quite so careless about their ordinations in those easy-going days as they are sometimes supposed to have been. A second attempt was more successful, as in 1772 he was ordained by Bishop Green of Lincoln. This was the same bishop who had ordained John Newton, but under far different conditions, for Newton when he was ordained was an intensely earnest believer, Scott little better than a sceptic. His first curacies were at Stoke Goldington and Weston Underwood, close to Olney, where John Newton was curate. The account he gives us in his *Force of Truth* of the way in which he made Newton's acquaintance—how he at first despised him as a Methodist, how he tried to argue with him, how gentle, forbearing, and judicious Newton was under his treatment, and how he finally became a full convert to Newton's views—is one of the most intensely interesting, perhaps, in mental history. How any one can read it and yet think Newton an overbearing bigot seems inconceivable.

In 1781 he became curate of Olney in Newton's place, and was even more unsuccessful there than Newton himself had been. His description of the spiritual condition of Olney is most depressing. "There are above 2000 inhabitants in this town, almost all Calvinists, even the most debauched of them, the Gospel having been preached among them for a number of years by a variety of preachers, statedly and occasionally, sound and unsound, in church and meeting. The inhabitants are become like David, wiser than their teachers; that is, they think themselves so, and in an awful manner have learned to abuse the Gospel notions, to stupify their consciences, vindicate their sloth and wickedness, and shield off conviction." Unlike Newton, he does not appear to have harmonised very well with Cowper and Mrs. Unwin, who were his most intelligent, if not his most powerful parishioners. So that we can well understand that in 1785 he would gladly avail himself of the chance of removing to London as joint chaplain to the Lock Hospital, where he eked out his scanty income by a lectureship at St. Mildred's, Bread Street, and by preaching every other Sunday at St. Margaret's, Lothbury, at 6 A.M. Then he began his *Commentary on the Bible*, which for some time was a source of expense rather

Olney.

The Lock Hospital.

than of income, and the end of the century found him still in London, overworked and underpaid. No doubt he was lacking in popular gifts. "Some things," he said, "requisite for popularity I would not have if I could; others I could not have if I would"; but still we cannot help feeling a little indignation at the way he was treated. It was certainly very much to his credit that as a preacher he was not popular, for the cause of his unpopularity was his moral courage in warning his Calvinistic audience against the danger of Calvinism lapsing into Antinomianism, which was not an imaginary but a real danger. Many of his published sermons, which, like Newton's, are plain and sensible, insist strongly upon this point, and we can well understand their giving offence. Yet here was a man of high character, earnest piety, and great power, all exercised in the service of religion, left almost to sour because he belonged to the calumniated party, and was regarded as a Methodist. But he was unquestionably regarded by the party itself as one of its foremost leaders, and his name is remembered long after many who were rewarded with twenty times his income have been forgotten.

Richard Cecil.

It is a contrast to turn from these rough diamonds, though of the first water, to the highly cultured and refined man, the friend of both of them and the biographer of one, who stands on the same level with them as an Evangelical leader. Richard Cecil (1748-1810) was the son of a London citizen who, though a scion of the Burleigh family, was head of a long-established business, in Chiswell Street, of scarlet dyeing for the East India Company; and Richard was trained for the same business. But he showed so much taste for literature and the fine arts that he was allowed to give up the uncongenial occupation, and he employed his time in writing poetry, playing the violin, in which he was proficient, and painting. In early life he had no sense of religion, and became an apostle of infidelity. But the prayers and example of his mother, a pious dissenter, led to his conversion, and he determined to enter the ministry. In 1773 he went to Queen's College, Oxford, and in 1776 received holy orders from the same bishop who ordained Newton and Scott. He was equally

acceptable as a clergyman both in London and in the country, but the church with which his name is chiefly connected was that of St. John's, Bedford Row, to the incumbency of which he was appointed in 1780. It was a proprietary chapel, and the income depended upon pew-rents.

There Cecil became known as a valuable acquisition to the Evangelical cause, and its great patron, William Wilberforce, secured him against all risks. St. John's, Bedford Row, was under Cecil one of the chief centres of Evangelicalism. On many points, however, Cecil held much wider and more enlightened views than were at all usual not only among Evangelicals but in the Church at large in the eighteenth century, and some of his sentiments expressed in the *Remains*—notably his exaltation of the priestly office, and his commendation of what was afterwards called the *Via Media*—must, we should have thought, have startled some of his friends. He says, for example: "The middle path is generally the wise path, but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of such things, Protestants have made too little of them. . . . Because one party has exalted the Virgin Mary as a divinity, the other can hardly think of that most highly favoured among women with common respect. The Papist puts the Apocrypha into his canon; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record. . . . Papists consider grace as inseparable from the participation of Sacraments; Protestants too often lose sight of them as instituted means of conveying grace." But his friends recognised that the root of the matter was in him, and were justly proud of his refinement and culture no less than of his piety. Without writing any great work, he won the reputation, which was thoroughly deserved, of being an intellectual light; and he threw himself heartily into numerous schemes of piety and benevolence, many of which were either planned or matured in the rectory of St. John's, Bedford Row.

Expulsion of the six students.

In 1768 six students were expelled from St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and from the University. They were called "Methodist students," but they should have rather been called Evangelical, for they belonged to the Calvinistic and not to the Arminian section of the

movement. Two were accused of being low-born — one being a weaver and another, Jones, a barber, who was said to have practised his trade in Oxford. Some were accused of being deficient in the learned languages, some of having preached in conventicles and frequenting conventicles. These offences were breaches of university discipline, being contrary to the statutes, and the Vice-Chancellor was therefore justified in expelling them. Some were accused of being acquainted with Methodists such as Venn, Newton, and Fletcher, three holy men from whom they could have received nothing but good. There is no sufficient evidence for Dr. Johnson's opinion that they were examined and found wanting. Still less for his comparison of their position to that of a cow in a garden. The Principal of the Hall, Dr. Dixon, defended them in the Vice-Chancellor's Court, declaring that he never remembered in his own or any other college six gentlemen whose lives were so exemplary and who behaved themselves in a more humble, regular, and peaceable manner. Dr. Horne, the President of Magdalen, protested in his stately way against what he regarded as the injustice of the proceedings. Their names were Benjamin Kay, James Matthews, Thomas Jones, Thomas Grove, Erasmus Middleton, and Joseph Skipman. The Vice-Chancellor pronounced sentence against them in the chapel of the Hall. One at least of them, Erasmus Middleton, became noted as an author, and his *Biographica Evangelica* is still cited as an authority.

There yet remain two names which stand in the front rank of the Evangelical leaders, those of the brothers Milner. Joseph Milner (1744-1797) the elder, having achieved a fair success at Cambridge both as a classic and mathematician, became after a time the headmaster of the grammar school at Hull and afternoon lecturer at Holy Trinity, the largest church in that town. He also served the church of North Ferriby, a village on the Humber, about eight miles to the west; and just before his death was appointed Vicar of Holy Trinity through the influence of William Wilberforce. He was the first of the many excellent Evangelical clergy for which Hull has been famous, and was one of the chief causes of the neighbourhood becoming an Evangelical centre. His sermons are remarkable as affording probably the first

Joseph Milner.

instance of an Evangelical leader overtly separating himself from Methodism, which Milner disowns almost as strongly as Popery itself. But it is, of course, chiefly as a writer that Joseph Milner is celebrated. His *History of the Church of Christ*, as it stands, is the work of several hands, but a very great part of it, at any rate, is by Joseph Milner. It has many defects and will not bear the criticism of experts, such as that which Dr. S. R. Maitland applied with scathing effect to the part dealing with the Waldenses; and it is written with too much bias to be regarded as history. But it has merits. It shows great general information, and, above all, it called attention to the long-neglected study of the early Fathers of the Church. It will be remembered that it was on this account chiefly that it fascinated John Henry Newman in his early years. Take it for all in all, it is perhaps the most considerable work that emanated from the Evangelical camp, though possibly some may think that this is not saying much, for the Evangelicals won respect more for their pious lives and practical labours than for their theological writings.

Isaac Milner.

Isaac Milner (1750-1820), the younger brother, was the abler and more distinguished of the two, and if his energy had been equal to his ability, he might have done something towards removing the slur which has, not unjustly, been cast upon the Evangelicals on the score of intellectual weakness. But he was generally indolent, and it was only on some great occasion that he could be roused to action. At Cambridge he was not only the best man of his year, but had the unique honour of the epithet "Incomparabilis" attached to his name at the head of the Mathematical Tripos in 1774, and there it remained in the Cambridge Calendar for many years. He was also first Smith's prizeman. He remained off and on at Cambridge, a great but latent force, for the remainder of his life. He was elected Fellow of his College (Queens') in 1776, the first Jacksonian Professor of Natural Experimental Philosophy in 1783, President of Queens' in 1788, and in 1791 was appointed Dean of Carlisle, being the first Evangelical who rose to any dignity. Bishop Pretyman, afterwards Tomline, of Lincoln, to his honour be it recorded,

was the man to whose indefatigable exertions in his behalf Milner owed this move, which was not, after all, by any means equal to his intellectual merits. The effort was all the more creditable to the bishop because he was by no means friendly to the Evangelical party, and wrote one of his best-known works, *A Refutation of Calvinism*, against them. But he was an able man himself and could appreciate ability in others. He had been tutor to William Pitt, whose life he afterwards wrote. Pitt always retained a high regard for him, and it was through this friendship that he was able to advance Milner's interests.

Milner retained his position at Cambridge along with the deanery, and in fact accepted the Lucasian professorship of Mathematics there in 1798, having resigned the Jacksonian chair in 1792. He divided his time between Cambridge and Carlisle, and pushed strongly the Evangelical cause at both. When he preached at Carlisle the cathedral was so crowded that "you might walk on the heads of the people." Under him Queens' became "a nursery of Evangelical neophytes," and he made no secret of using his immense influence to secure the election of Evangelical fellows and in other ways promoting the cause. He was in the zenith of his fame when the eighteenth century ended, and remained influential during the first twenty years of the nineteenth. He thus formed a link between the first and second generations of Evangelicalism. All his writings before 1800 were on mathematical and philosophical subjects, and therefore do not come within the limits of this volume. It was his devotion to the memory of his dead brother, to whom he owed everything in life, that stirred him up to write in defence of the *History of the Church of Christ* against Dr. Haweis, and also to continue, to revise, and greatly improve his brother's part in that history. Like many of the Evangelicals, he was full of kindliness, and indeed boisterous merriment, an admirable talker, and in that and in other respects not unlike Dr. Johnson. But though he found in his niece, Mary Milner, an excellent biographer, she was not a Boswell to immortalise his conversational powers, which we have therefore to take on trust. He was like Dr. Johnson also in his huge frame and in the robustness and manliness of his mind.

With these he combined a curious mixture of shyness and nervousness, which may probably account for his constitutional indolence, for his not writing more, and indeed not doing more outside his own special spheres in behalf of the cause which he unquestionably had very near at heart. He was a great figure (great in every sense of the word) in the background, rather than a prominent leader of the Evangelicals, but in his own way he was unique.

If this were a history of the Evangelical movement, many other good clergymen who identified themselves with it—such as Thomas Robinson of Leicester; William Richardson of York; Moses Browne, Vicar of Olney, where Newton and Scott were curates; Stillingfleet of Hotham, at whose rectory Joseph Milner wrote a great part of his Church History; Henry Foster, the coadjutor of Romaine and the great friend of Cecil—would have to be mentioned. But these hardly reach the first rank, and there are others who did reach that rank afterwards, but had not reached it when the eighteenth century closed. As, therefore, the Evangelical movement in this volume only forms part of a larger subject, the line must be drawn, and we must pass on from the clergy to the laity who helped on the movement.

AUTHORITIES.—The sources for the Calvinistic controversy are to be sought, first of all, in the letters between George Whitefield and John Wesley; see Whitefield's *Letters* and Gledstone's *Life* of Whitefield, pp. 200-242 *passim*. *Cf. The Christian Observer*, October 1857, p. 696, Review of *The Coronet and the Cross*, by Rev. A. H. Mew; Hervey's *Theron and Aspasio*, with John Wesley's remarks thereon and Hervey's reply, all published in 1755; *Minutes of the Conference of* 1770; Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism* and Toplady's *More Work for John Wesley* (*Works*, v. 363, *sqq.*). Henry Venn and the Venn family generally are dealt with in an exhaustive and masterly manner in a work recently written by Dr. John Venn, the President of Gonville and Caius, *The Venn Family Annals* (Macmillan, 1904), a model of the way in which family history should be written. See also *The Memoir of Henry Venn* prefixed to the R.T.S. edition of *The Complete Duty of Man*. John Newton's *Narrative* and his *Letters to a Wife* throw most light on his life and character; they are in his *Works*, with a Memoir by Cecil. For Thomas Scott see *Life* by J. Scott, 1822. Cecil is best studied in the *Remains*, edited by Joseph Pratt. Isaac Milner wrote the *Life of Joseph Milner*, 1814. For Isaac Milner see *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The letters of John Newton to Lord Dartmouth will be found in the *Dartmouth Letters*, Historical MSS. Commission, vol. iii. appendix, part i. The whole collection of these letters should be consulted.

CHAPTER XIII

MINOR CURRENTS UP TO 1789

NOTHING shows more strikingly the crying need of a revival of religion in the dreary days of the first two Georges than the absence of the names of laymen who took any practical interest, or were at all active in Church work. In this respect Robert Nelson, Robert Boyle, John Kyrle, Lord Weymouth, Lord Digby, Peter Barnville, and many other active churchmen had no immediate successors. The Evangelical movement, among other causes, certainly tended to reawaken in laymen an interest in Christian effort, and the briefest sketch of it would be imperfect if it did not give prominence to the part in it taken by pious laymen. The first, in point of date, is one who has been already mentioned in connexion with John Newton. John Thornton (1720-1790) was a merchant prince who looked upon his money as being literally a talent to be devoted to his Divine Master's use. He was one of the first leading laymen who cast in his lot with the Evangelicals, then a very small body. His father lived on Clapham Common, and he himself lived long enough to see the nucleus formed of that little knot of good men commonly known as the "Clapham Sect."

John Thornton.

John Thornton's services to Christianity and philanthropy generally and to the Evangelical party cannot be better described than in the language of his accomplished friend, Richard Cecil, in the following passage: - "He purchased advowsons and presentations with a view to place in parishes the most enlightened, active, and useful

ministers. He employed the extensive commerce in which he was engaged as a powerful instrument for conveying immense quantities of Bibles, Prayer Books, and the most useful publications to every place visited by our trade. He printed, at his sole expense, large editions of the latter for that purpose, and it may be safely affirmed that there is scarcely a part of the known world, where such books could be introduced, which did not feel the salutary influence of this single individual. He was a philanthropist on the largest scale, the friend of man under all his wants. Instances might be mentioned of it, were it proper to particularise, which would surprise those who did not know Mr. Thornton. They were so much out of ordinary course and expectation, that I know some who felt it their duty to inquire of him whether the sum they had received was sent by his intention or by mistake. To this may be added, that the manner of presenting his gifts was as delicate and concealed as the measure was large. Besides this constant course of private donations, there was scarcely a public charity, or occasion of relief to the ignorant or necessitous, which did not meet with his distinguished support. His only question was, May the miseries of men in any measure be removed or alleviated? Nor was he merely distinguished by stretching out a liberal hand; his benevolent heart was so intent on doing good, that he was ever inventing or promoting plans for its diffusion at home or abroad."

His splendid munificence is commemorated in verse as well as in prose. The poet Cowper, who knew well what he had done at Olney, in his poem on "Charity," thus commemorates him by name:

> Some men make gain a fountain, whence proceeds
> A stream of liberal and heroic deeds,
> The swell of pity, not to be confined
> Within the scanty limits of the mind,
> Disdains the bank, and throws the golden sands,
> A rich deposit, on the bord'ring lands:
> These have an ear for *His* paternal call,
> Who makes some rich for the supply of all,
> God's gift with pleasure in His praise employ,
> And *Thornton* is familiar with the joy.

Henry Thornton (1760-1815), the second son of John

Thornton, became not only as rich, but also as munificent a man as his father, holding the same religious views, and becoming one of the leading members of the Clapham Sect. Before his marriage in 1796, he used to give away six-sevenths of his large income, reserving only one-seventh for his own use. When he had children he could not, of course, be so lavish, but he still gave two-thirds of his income away. He allowed Hannah More no less than £600 a year for her schools, and his other benefactions were on the same grand scale. For five or six years, when they were both unmarried, he and William Wilberforce shared a house at Battersea Rise on Clapham Common, but his history hardly belongs to our present period, for it was in the last decade of the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth century that he was most prominent. The same may be said of William Wilberforce (1759-1833), who did not join the Evangelical party until 1787, when he had for some time been under the influence of Isaac Milner. Although, therefore, he stands first among the Evangelical laity, it will be better to postpone the notice of him until the next period, to which, so far as it falls within the eighteenth century at all, his life as an Evangelical properly belongs.

Henry Thornton.

William Wilberforce.

William Cowper (1731-1800) is another layman who, in one sense, did more for the Evangelical cause than any other man, lay or cleric. Of course the services he rendered were exclusively in writing, for the shy recluse of Olney and Weston Underwood was the last to enter in any other way into the fray. Cowper wished emphatically to be regarded as a religious poet. "What there is of a religious cast in the volume," he says in the preface to *The Task*, "I have thrown towards the end of it, for two reasons: first, that I might not revolt the reader at his entrance; and secondly, that my best impressions might be made last. Were I to write as many volumes as Lope de Vega or Voltaire, not one of them would be without this tincture. If the world like it not, so much the worse for them. I make all the concessions I can, that I may please them; but I will not please them at the expense of conscience." That he also showed his power as a satirist and humourist is true; but

William Cowper.

then are not some of his best touches of satire and humour directly connected with his Evangelical opinions? It must always be remembered that it was an essential part of Evangelicalism proper to promote practical reformation, especially of the clergy, quite as much as to inculcate its peculiar doctrines. Indeed, the two things were, to the Evangelical mind, one and the same regarded from different points of view. Such passages, therefore, as the following would be to them Evangelicalism pure and simple :—

> Would I describe a preacher, such as Paul,
> Were he on earth, would hear, approve, and own,
> Paul should himself direct me. I would trace
> His master-strokes, and draw from his design.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Behold the picture! Is it like?—Like whom?
> The things that mount the rostrum with a skip
> And then skip down again; pronounce a text;
> Cry—hem; and reading what they never wrote
> Just fifteen minutes, huddle up their work,
> And with a well-bred whisper close the scene!
>
> *The Time-Piece.*

Methodism, under which comprehensive term the whole of the Evangelical revival was by many in the eighteenth century included, was from its outset accused of driving people mad. When Whitefield preached his first sermon on June 27, 1736, at St. Mary-de-Crypt, Gloucester, a complaint was made to the bishop that fifteen persons had been driven mad, to which the shrewd prelate, the excellent Bishop Benson, only replied that he hoped the madness might not be forgotten before another Sunday. John Wesley rather gloried in the charge, and the later Methodists and Evangelicals had to bear it and were not ashamed of it. Now Cowper undoubtedly at times suffered from melancholy madness. And he was also as undoubtedly, in the eighteenth-century sense of the term, "a Methodist." It is enough to remember that he was more or less mentally afflicted long before he became a specially religious man, and that it was the morbid introspection which the Evangelicals encouraged which led to his religious poems being of a subjective rather than of an objective character. But it must never be forgotten that his

Cowper's madness.

happiest years were those spent in the most active exercise of religious duties at Olney, that his first and most serious attack of madness, which all but cost him his life, was before he became an Evangelical, and his last after the influence of John Newton, his spiritual director, had for many years been in abeyance. The mere fact that one of the first poets of the day cast in his lot with the Evangelicals tended greatly to strengthen their cause. Thousands read his poems who would not read mere hymns nor be likely to be influenced by the sermons of the Evangelical preachers. In fact, they would probably have been repelled by them. But his poetry was read by all, and influenced the thought and speech particularly of the rising generation. With Jane Austen, to take simply one example, Cowper was one of her great teachers, and she shows his strong influence upon her in *Sense and Sensibility* more especially. Marianne complains of the spiritless, tame reading by Edward of the poet: "To hear those beautiful lines, which have frequently driven me wild, pronounced with such impenetrable calmness, such dreadful indifference!" Or again, Edward declares that Marianne would buy up every copy of Cowper, Thomson, and Scott to prevent their falling into unworthy hands. It was the sensibility rather than the intellectuality of his poetry that drew such hearts towards him.

Jane Austen and Cowper.

The second Earl of Dartmouth (1731-1801), to whom some reference has already been made, was specially interested in Cowper, and in his letters to the earl Newton makes constant mention of the poet's condition and life. Thus, writing on May 22, 1773, he says: "He is perfectly sensible as to common things, but is a continual prey to distressing and gloomy thoughts, which he has no power to resist. . . . He is now sitting by me, disconsolate. How little is the blessing of a fine understanding assisted by the advantages of education and literature. A slight alteration in the animal spirits or in the texture of the blood is sufficient to cloud the faculties, so that the gross illusions of the powers of darkness shall be received as if they were sealed to the mind with the indubitable impressions of truth. Lately he rejoiced in communion with God, was assured of his accept-

Earl of Dartmouth.

ance in the Beloved, and lived upon the foretaste of Eternal glory. . . ."

It was Dartmouth who had generously provided Newton and his friends, Mrs. Unwin and Cowper, with the improved and enlarged vicarage at Olney. Dartmouth had been at school with Cowper, and never lost his interest in him and his affection for him. The earl was one of the most enlightened and cultured men of his day, and was constantly consulted by persons interested in science, art, literature, and social progress, as well as on Church affairs. The Polar expedition of 1774 and the inventions of James Watt, found in him an ardent supporter. He became President of the Royal Society, and in 1779 was asked to accept the presidency of the Society of Antiquaries. In Parliament he supported the Evangelicals in their endeavours to purify and reform the social life of the time. When a petition was presented to Parliament for leave to bring in a Bill to license a theatre at Birmingham, he was one of those who helped to throw the Bill out, and it is curious to note the public opinion of Birmingham on the question as shown by an inquiry made of all those who paid rates. Out of 2449, 1468 were against the suggested theatre; only 124 supported it, 192 were neutral, and 665 were not at home when called upon. The reasons alleged against the Bill are also worth reading. "Because it will subject the inhabitants to the painful necessity of admitting players into the town, whether agreeable or disagreeable to the people; as there will then remain no power, either to the inhabitants or Civil Magistrate, to prevent their coming to act, or to correct any abuse which may arise from their acting. Because it is supposed that the practice of forcing playhouse tickets upon dependent workmen, as part of their wages, will increase to a very great degree, when such practice cannot be suppressed by a removal of the players who promote it." It should be borne in mind that, in objecting to the building of a theatre Birmingham was following the precedent long set by and still operative in the City of London, within whose boundaries no theatre was then allowed to exist.

Theatre in Birmingham.

Meanwhile, it must not be forgotten that there was in the first half of George III.'s reign a body of churchmen increasing

in both numbers and influence who were not of the Evangelical school. The repression of enthusiasm, which was so marked a feature in the Church of the eighteenth century, brought about this natural result. A number of good and earnest men who were churchmen by conviction, and never were, and never could be alienated from the Church as their proper home, seem to have found that its system, in the dry and barren form in which it was presented to them in those stagnant days, required to be supplemented by something which would appeal to the emotional part, and satisfy the emotional wants of that complex being called man. The Wesleys found this in Methodism, William Law in Mysticism, others, who are now to be noticed, in what was called Hutchinsonianism. They all remained churchmen to the backbone, and desired not the slightest alteration in the doctrine or discipline or formularies of the Church. Their "ism" was something superadded, and was never intended to be a hindrance but rather a help to their true spiritual mother. Unlike the Wesleyans, the Hutchinsonians rose much above the level of their founder. It is no derogation to the former to say that John Wesley towered head and shoulders above any of them, but it is only doing justice to the latter to say that some of them towered head and shoulders above John Hutchinson. In other words, Wesley was Wesleyanism. Hutchinson was not Hutchinsonianism.

Hutchinsonianism.

John Hutchinson (1674-1737) was never the leader of a party, and those who were contemptuously called after him protested against the name, as, for example, Horne, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, and Jones of Nayland, and were indeed only so far connected with him that they adopted, more or less, the opinions he broached in his principal work *Moses's Principia*, the first part of which appeared in 1724, and the second in 1727. The most notable of these opinions was that Hebrew was the primitive language revealed to man from heaven, and that in the Hebrew roots lay concealed the whole of revealed truth. The language was, according to Hutchinsonian ideas, to be interpreted mystically, and points and accents were to be discarded as later human inventions. Of course the Hebrew language meant the Old Testament, which Hutchinson believed contained, among other

John Hutchinson.

things, a complete system of physical science, and he contended that the Hebrew Scriptures were, when rightly translated, impregnable against any system of natural philosophy. This system was completely at variance with the discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton, and Hutchinson's *Moses's Principia* was directly opposed to the *Principia* of Newton. Hutchinson laid great stress upon the correspondence between the world of nature and the world of grace, and found emblems of the Trinity in Unity in many natural phenomena. It will be seen that his principles were philosophically, rather than theologically heterodox. He did not succeed in exploding the belief in the law of gravitation or of centripetal and centrifugal force, nor did his followers, if followers they can be called, lay stress upon this part of his system. What attracted them was his spiritual method of interpreting Holy Scripture and his intense reverence for it. Scripture had been treated too much as matter for mere intellectual discussion, and too little as the spiritual nutriment of the soul and the inspiration and guide for the deeper and more important activities of the spirit.

The Hutchinsonians.

There were several men of real eminence who, to a certain extent, adopted his views, especially at Oxford, where three heads of houses, Dr. Horne, President of Magdalen, Dr. Hodges, Provost of Oriel, and Dr. Wetherell, Master of University, if not more, were known as Hutchinsonians. So, too, were John Parkhurst, writer both of a Greek and a Hebrew Lexicon, which were once standard works; Alexander Catcott, a noted geologist in his day, the opponent of Bishop Clayton of Clogher; Duncan Forbes, President of the Court of Session at Edinburgh in the exciting times of the Porteous Riot and the Rebellion of 1745; and William Jones of Nayland, one of the most important theological writers of the eighteenth century, and his friend and relative, William Stevens; Samuel Johnson of Connecticut, one of the principal leaders of the English Church in America; and Berkeley, son of the great bishop. These are all more eminent men than Hutchinson himself, but only three of them claim attention in this work at present—George Horne, William Jones, and William Stevens. They form a trio, being inextricably linked together somewhat in the same way as that

other trio, Butler, Secker, and Benson. Jones was the biographer of Horne, and Stevens was the biographer of Jones. Stevens was the cousin of Horne, Jones dedicated to Stevens his *Life of Horne*, and Horne was always "the dear friend and patron" of Jones, as the latter gratefully records. Horne, moreover, helped Jones in his answer to Clayton, and Jones helped Horne in his reply to Priestley. All three were only partly Hutchinsonians, and, as we have already seen, were unreservedly High churchmen. At the same time, they furnished a striking instance of extremes meeting, for in their interpretation of Scripture they constantly remind us, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Puritan method. But let us by an effort disentangle them, for they deserve each a separate notice.

George Horne.

George Horne (1730-1792) passed the greater part of his life at Oxford, and had all the qualities of a university man of the best type. We find both in his life and writings the dignity and clear-headedness which we have a right to expect from one who was successively Scholar of University, Fellow of Magdalen, and President of Magdalen. He was appointed Dean of Canterbury in 1781, and became Bishop of Norwich in 1789. He was an able and learned man, and his constant association with the better type of Oxford men (he would have nothing to do with the worse), which his long residence and influential position at the university brought, naturally tended to elevate and refine him. His style of writing is cultured, and his wit, which is frequent, is never coarse or ill-timed. One of his humorous sayings was that "if the intended reformation of our liturgy goes on, the reformers may hereafter bring us in a bill like that of the Cirencester painter:—Mr. C. Terebee to Joseph Cook, debtor: To mending the Commandments, altering the Belief, and making a new Lord's Prayer, 21*l.* 1*s.*" His attitude towards the Methodists shows a curious mixture of appreciation, a desire to treat them fairly, and a little intellectual contempt. He and John Wesley seem thoroughly to have appreciated one another, and a short time before his death he judiciously refused to interfere as bishop with Wesley's ministrations. "If the minister of the parish made no objection, he should make none." His sense of justice also led him to

disapprove strongly of the expulsion of the six Methodist students.

On the other hand, the crudeness of much of the early Methodist theology grated upon the well-read, cultured mind of the Oxford scholar, and he expressed his repugnance to it strongly in a sermon from the university pulpit in 1761. "What wonder," he said, "Antinomianism is rampant when men, instead of having recourse to the catholic doctors of the ancient Church, extract their theology from the latest and lowest of our sectaries; if, instead of drawing living water from the fresh springs of primitive antiquity, they take such as comes to them at second-hand from Geneva; and Clement and Ignatius pass for moderate divines compared to the new lights of the Tabernacle and the Foundry?"

William Jones (1726-1800) occupies a somewhat peculiar position in the Church of the eighteenth century. He was certainly regarded as, in a sort of way, the leader of that little band of churchmen who handed on the torch from the great Caroline divines to the precursors of the Oxford school, the interval being occupied by the Non-Jurors. And yet he not only never rose to any ecclesiastical eminence, but was forced, almost to the end of his life, to take tutorial work, which he ought to have been spared, in order to eke out his income, and all but fell into actual want at last. In fact, had it not been first for Archbishop Secker and then for Archbishop Moore, one of the most telling and popular Church writers of his day would have been utterly neglected, to the great scandal of the Church. Jones was born at Lowick in 1726, and from thence went as a scholar to Charterhouse, and in 1745 proceeded, with a Charterhouse exhibition, to University College, Oxford. There he formed a life-long friendship with George Horne, who, however, was not in a position to help his friend until late in life. Jones, like Law, soon showed himself a formidable *malleus hereticorum*, employing the same sort of caustic and pungent wit as well as powerful logic. He was only twenty-seven years old when he entered the lists against a veteran, Robert Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, who in 1751 revived the Arian Controversy in a new form by his powerful *Essay on Spirit, with some Remarks on the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds*. Jones was helped

Jones of Nayland.

in this work by his friend Horne; and three years later, in 1756, he published a more elaborate work on a kindred subject, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity proved from Scripture.* This book attracted the attention of Archbishop Secker, who in 1764 gave him the vicarage of Bethersden, and in 1765 the more valuable rectory of Pluckley, both in his diocese, "as some reward for his able defence of Christian orthodoxy." Pluckley, however, did not turn out to be so valuable as was expected, and Jones was obliged to take pupils, and for twelve years he went on working in the threefold capacity of pedagogue, parish priest, and prolific writer. It was not till 1777 that he accepted the perpetual curacy of Nayland in Suffolk, and thenceforth became known, and is known, as Jones of Nayland.

William Stevens.

William Stevens (1732-1807), the third of the trio, like so many good churchmen in the time of Queen Anne, and so few in those of the first two Georges, worked hard for the Church without ever entering her ministry, thinking (like Robert Nelson and Henry Dodwell a hundred years before) that he could do the Church better service, and would be less suspected of interested motives, if he remained a layman. He was the son of a London tradesman, and a London tradesman himself, being born in the parish of St. Saviour, Southwark, and living the greater part of his life at 68, Old Broad Street in the City. His mother was a sister of Bishop Horne's father, and the two cousins were educated at Maidstone by a learned clergyman, Deodatus Bye, until 1746, when Horne went to Oxford, and Stevens at the same time became apprentice to a hosier, by whom he was taken into partnership in 1754. He was a diligent student, and in the intervals of his business, which he never neglected, he became a theological writer of no mean repute. No doubt his intimacy with his cousin, George Horne, and also with William Jones, stimulated and aided him; but after making allowance for these advantages, it is a remarkable fact that a busy London hosier could make himself a fair classical scholar, acquire a knowledge of French and Hebrew, and write well on theological subjects. Moreover, he found time for doing practical work for the Church, in which his business talents would stand him in good stead. He was treasurer

of Queen Anne's Bounty and he became a liberal benefactor to the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy and to the Clergy Orphan School, to Christ's Hospital, the Magdalen Hospital, and other public charities, a staunch supporter of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and, above all, of the fund for aiding the poor bishops and clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, of which we shall hear more in a future chapter. His memory is perpetuated by the well-known Church Club called "Nobodys" or "The Club of Nobody's Friends." "Nobody" was William Stevens himself. He was wont to give familiar appellations to his friends, and this was his own. In 1777 he collected his writings into a single volume, which he entitled Οὐδενὸς ἔργα.

The Hutchinsonians were opposed diametrically to the Warburtonians, and still more strongly to those who for some years agitated for a relaxation of subscription to the Articles and the Liturgy, and who were more or less verging towards Unitarianism. The attempt was abortive, and never had the least chance of success. The first who set the ball rolling was John Jones, Vicar of Alconbury, who in 1749 published anonymously a work entitled *Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England*, proposing the same kind of alterations which had been agitated in 1689. He was answered among others by Thomas Boswell, and this brought into the field Francis Blackburne (1705-1787), who wrote an *Apology for the Authors of the "Free and Candid Disquisitions."* He was immediately afterwards made Archdeacon of Cleveland, and soon after the change of the Calendar in 1752, when people's minds were somewhat puzzled about the proper days for observing the great Festivals of the Church, published a sermon advocating the abolition of such Festivals altogether. Bishop Clayton's (1695-1758) *Essay on Spirit*, in favour of the abolition of subscription to the Articles and Liturgy, came out about the same time, and later, in 1766, the controversy reached its head by the publication of Archdeacon Blackburne's notorious book *The Confessional*, which practically advocated the abolition of subscription not only to the Articles and Liturgy, but to the Creeds themselves. This elicited many

Anti-Subscription Movement.

answers, the most effectual, perhaps, being that of Jones of Nayland in his *Remarks on the Confessional.* Jones took a true Church line, by showing that what was really aimed at was latitude on the vital doctrine of the Trinity. How true this was appeared by the result.

Blackburne, now for the first time speaking in his own name and not as hitherto anonymously, and his friends met together at the Feathers' Tavern in the Strand to consider and draw up a petition to Parliament for the abolition of subscription. The basis of discussion was Blackburne's *Proposals for an Application to Parliament for Relief in the Matter of Subscription to the Liturgy and Thirty-nine Articles.* This had first been printed in 1771, and the first meeting was held on July 17 in that same year. The petition which was agreed upon based its appeal on the ground that the Reformation had given to Christians a natural right in searching the Scriptures to judge what may or may not be proved thereby. That the acknowledgment by subscription to certain articles and confessions of faith and doctrine drawn up by fallible men, and purporting to be all and every of them agreeable to the said Scriptures, in a great measure foreclosed the possibility of the exercise of this natural right of judgment. And the petitioners prayed to be relieved from such an imposition upon their judgment, and to have restored to them their undoubted rights as Protestants to interpret Scripture for themselves, without being bound by any human interpretations thereof, or required to acknowledge by subscription or declaration the truth of any formulary whatsoever beside Holy Scripture itself. It was a thorough-going statement of the most extreme Protestant individualism, and appears to have entirely overlooked the causes which had led to the growth of Church dogma. They ignored authoritative teaching both as a safeguard against heresy, and as a guarantee to the Church itself of the orthodoxy of its teachers.

Feathers' Tavern petition.

Only some two hundred and fifty signatures were obtained, of which many were those of Deists, Socinians, and Arians. No name of any importance appeared except that of Blackburne himself. There were those who were in sympathy with the movement, but who would not commit

themselves to the petition. Bishop Edward Law, whose son, John Law, signed it, Dr. Watson, and Dr. Paley were among the number. A strong exhibition of public opinion against it was feared, and Blackburne said that his own friends had added a fortieth article, short though it was, to the already oppressive thirty-nine. It contained only two words, Public peace. Romaine vowed that he would never again enter a pulpit if the proposal were made effective. The King was very strongly opposed to the petition, as is seen in his correspondence with Lord North, and Lord North spoke against it as disturbing the quiet of the Church and tending towards anarchy, confusion, and dissension. The most important speech in the debate was that of Edmund Burke, who, after dwelling upon the undesirability and danger of changes in religion, indicated the general want of interest in the question manifested by the majority both of clergy and people. If only two hundred and fifty desired the change, the feelings and opinions of the silent majority were worthy of prior consideration. There must be a concurrence of the inclinations of the majority of the people with the sense of Parliament itself that change was necessary, before legislation in the direction of change could be justified. Further, he denied the existence of any hardship. The petitioners were clergy of the Church of England who wished to receive its emoluments, while teaching doctrines differing from those for the support of which the emoluments of the Church were designed. There could be no hardship in the face of the existing laws of toleration. Men were not obliged to remain in the Establishment. Many forms of dissent were open to them unhampered by any such subscription; or, if those were found intolerant of such opinions, there was nothing to prevent the discontented from assembling congregations of their own. The question was simply one of finance. He argued against the Bible as a bond of union or a summary of faith, and declared it to be impossible for any Church to exist without a fixed standard of belief. It is worth while noting how far Burke was in advance of his time in the study of the Bible. While the Evangelicals and Methodists, at any rate, were treating the Bible as a single volume of one texture and of equal value

Edmund Burke.

throughout, Burke asked significantly, "What is that Scripture to which they are content to subscribe? They do not think that a book becomes of Divine authority because it is bound in blue morocco, and is printed by John Basket and his assigns? The Bible is a vast collection of different treatises. A man who holds the authority of one may consider another as merely human." The House refused to receive the petition by a majority of 146 in a House of 288 members.

The question was again brought forward in 1773 and 1774, but no progress was made. Cambridge men favoured the aim of the petition, as we see in the case of Watson, Paley, Jebb, John Law; and a little later the university modified the form of subscription for its members. Some of the leaders of the movement became avowed Unitarians, thus clearly indicating what it had meant to at least many of its advocates. It may be added that none were more strongly opposed to the movement than the Methodists and the Evangelicals.

Suggested Liturgical revision.

An attempt was made in 1772 to revise the Prayer Book. Probably Archbishop Cornwallis, easy-going, indifferent churchman that he was, had let it become known that he would listen to proposals on the subject, and a petition was accordingly presented to him, supported by Beilby Porteus, afterwards Bishop of London. In this petition some expressed the opinion that it would be sufficient to subscribe to the orthodox Articles only, meaning those that relate to the fundamental doctrines of the Creed. Others thought that subscription should be required from the clergy only, and that all lay subscription should be abolished. Toplady, among others, was much distressed at the petition, and alleged that it had originated at Lambeth, and that if sanctioned the new Lambeth Articles would be of a very different type from those put forth in 1595. The bishops were against the change, and were supported by the Government, and the movement died away.

It was a pity that these suggestions should have been mixed up with danger to the essential verities of the faith, for some of them, at any rate, might well have been adopted, and indeed have been since adopted with advantage to the Church. Among the proposals of Jones of Alconbury, to which reference

was made above, were a new translation of the Scriptures, shortening the Morning Service, that is, the three services, the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the pre-Communion, which used to be read together, a new Lectionary, discontinuance of the custom of Private Baptism, and of enforcing subscription on youths at school, which have mostly now been carried out. Many good churchmen, too, would now go with him in his opinion that the Reformation work had not been absolutely perfect, that even the Liturgy might be improved, and that the Articles, written in a time of hot controversy and in the sixteenth century, long before the Church of England, as it is, had been fully settled, were subjects open to amendment. But, as has been already remarked, the mind of the eighteenth century was stiff and unbending to the last degree; or rather there was in it a disastrous mixture of laxity in practice and narrowness in theory. The most absurd alarm was raised by the most innocent changes. For instance, the alteration of the Calendar, according to the Gregorian computation, in 1752, produced a panic in which there was a strong mixture of physical and theological alarm. Some thought that they were being deprived of eleven days of their time, and "Give us back our eleven days" was an effective election cry in 1753. It was a Pope, Gregory XIII., who promulgated the New Style. Could there be a doubt about the ultimate design of its introduction into England? The same narrow-mindedness created a far more serious and riotous alarm in 1753, when a Bill was with difficulty passed through both Houses of Parliament allowing Jews to be naturalised in England without receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It was infinitely to the credit of the Bench of bishops that they incurred intense odium for not opposing the Bill *en masse* in its passage through the House of Lords. The following passage in *The Craftsman* of July 7, 1753, on the subject is worth quoting, because that paper is rightly supposed to have reflected the higher intelligence of the nation:—

Suggested reforms.

New Calendar.

Naturalisation of Jews.

"When Christianity subsisted in this kingdom it would have been the grossest absurdity to introduce a Bill of this

nature. But the Christian dispensation has entirely disappeared among us, and I believe, in the memory of the oldest person now living, no trace of it can be found, which is, in my opinion, a conclusive argument in favour of this Naturalisation Act. Were it in any way inconsistent with the religion now in fashion, I flatter myself it would have met with opposition from a certain Bench in the H—— of L——; but as nothing of this kind was offered, it is to be presumed that Judaism properly coincides with our present disposition in Church and State; and I would therefore recommend this doctrine to be preached from the pulpit for the better quieting of the minds of men; and if the reverend prelates would issue out letters to the purpose, the remedy would be quicker in its operation, and the mistaken notions which the common people have imbibed would be the sooner effaced."

The Bishop of Norwich, Thomas Hayter, honourably distinguished himself by giving the bill an active support, and consequently became a special object of vituperation and insult. The opposition was so strong that the measure had to be rescinded, and that opposition was mainly based on the religious ground that, the nation would be unchristianised and the Church undone if Jews were admitted to any of the rights of citizenship. If the opponents had been men who were leading a strictly Christian life themselves, their earnestness might have been respected, though their narrowness might be regretted. But the very reverse was the case, and there never was a time when Christianity as a practical force was at a lower ebb in England than when these unseemly agitations took place in its name.

Twenty-five years later came another and more signal proof of popular intolerance as regards religion. In 1778 Sir George Savile carried a Bill through Parliament for the relief of English Roman Catholics, which was nothing more than a scant and tardy act of justice to a considerable and not disloyal part of the King's subjects. It provided for the repeal of the punishment of priests who officiated in the services of their Church; of the power of the son of a Roman Catholic father to take possession of his father's estate, and of the disability of Roman Catholics from acquiring landed property by other

Roman Catholic Emancipation.

means than descent. The Act provided that, in order to obtain the benefit of its operation, Roman Catholics should take a special oath abjuring the Pretender, the temporal jurisdiction of the Pope, and the power of deposition, as well as the doctrine that faith should not be kept with heretics, and that heretics, as such, may lawfully be put to death. The Church and realm of England were thus safeguarded against papal aggression and civil rebellion. The Bill was carried in both Houses without a division, with the consent of the English bishops, and by the united action of both parties in the State. In the first instance, it applied to England only, but in the following year it was proposed to apply it to Scotland; but the Scottish hatred of Popery, always more fierce than that of the southerner, was too bitter and inflammable, and the proposal led to a fierce and dangerous agitation in the Lowlands. The Scottish Roman Catholics were alarmed, and begged Lord North not to push the matter further in Parliament. But it was too late. Both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, in January 1779, riots broke out. Roman Catholic dwellings and meeting-places were burned. Shops were destroyed and plundered. Ladies were compelled to take refuge in the Castle in Edinburgh. Even Protestants who were known to sympathise with the movement were not spared. The troops, though called out, were not allowed to fire on the rioters, and the authorities issued a proclamation to the effect that the proposal was entirely put aside.

Abjuration Oath.

Scottish Riots.

The result of the success of rioting in Scotland was the Gordon Riots of 1780, when London was for three days in the hands of a brutal and illiterate mob, encouraged, it is to be feared, by many who ought to have known better. Lord George Gordon was himself a Scotsman, fierce, fanatical, unscrupulous, eccentric. In the House of Commons he was only laughed at. But outside he found many followers. A Protestant Association was organised, and at a meeting, over which he presided, on May 29, 1780, it was resolved that 20,000 men should march to Westminster and demand the repeal of the Relief Act of 1778. Unable to gain their object by mere demonstration of

Gordon Riots.

numbers, backed by a petition alleged to have been signed by nearly 120,000 persons, they soon tried violence. The Houses were invaded, the members seized, compelled to wear the blue cockade of the Association, to cry "No Popery," and to promise to fulfil the prayer of the petition. Some members of the Upper House, including the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Lincoln, were roughly treated. The petition was presented in the Commons by Gordon himself, and the House decided to adjourn its consideration for a few days. The doors were locked, and for several hours the mob held the two Houses in a state of siege. When the troopers appeared about nine in the evening, the crowd dispersed. But they were not thus to be put off. Some attacked the Roman chapel in Duke Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, and plundered it, burning the benches in the street and throwing them while burning into the chapel. The Bavarian chapel in Golden Square was burnt down. This was on the Friday, and by night the rioters were dispersed, some being captured. Saturday and part of Sunday were quiet, but on Sunday afternoon the Moorfields Roman chapel was burnt.

Petition to Parliament.

June 2, 1780.

After this the control of the rioters completely passed out of the hands of the merely fanatical Protestants and into those of any mob leader, and on the Monday more outrages took place. Chapels were burnt in Wapping, in Nightingale Lane, and a school in Hoxton. The houses and shops of those who had given evidence against the rioters were attacked and burnt. The house of Sir George Savile in Leicester Square was specially marked out for destruction, as he had proposed the Relief Bill in the Commons. The authorities could do nothing. London was in the hands of the mob. The following day, Tuesday, saw the destruction of Newgate, the largest and strongest prison in England. The prisoners were let loose and the prison burnt. The climax came on the Wednesday, "Black Wednesday," as it was called. There was no attempt on the part of the authorities to arrest rioters who could easily have been taken. Dr. Johnson saw a party of less than a hundred men plundering the Old Bailey Sessions house. "They did their work at leisure, in full

June 5, 1780.

June 7, 1780.

serenity, without sentinels, without trepidation, as men lawfully employed in full day." In the evening all London seemed to be in flames. An attack was made on the Bank, but this was repulsed. The soldiers began to fire on the mob, particularly at Blackfriars Bridge. An outrage in Holborn, near St. Andrew's church, seems to have sobered even many of the rioters. The premises of a Roman Catholic distiller were pillaged and burnt. The great casks of raw spirits were staved in and the liquid ran down the streets, men and women and children eagerly filling vessels, or even their hands, with it. Many were killed by their excess. At length the fire reached the alcoholic stream, and many were burned while lying drunk in the street or by the falling in of the roof and walls of the distillery. In the meantime, troops had been brought into London and order was restored.

Some who ought to have known better encouraged this Anti-Popery feeling. John Wesley, for example, in the very year of the riots, published a letter to the *Public Advertiser*, in which occur the following "singularly unwise words": "Let there be as boundless a freedom in religion as any man can conceive. . . . Yet I insist upon it that no Government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion." Can it therefore be wondered at that the Methodists, as Horace Walpole and Sir Samuel Romilly both positively affirm, "were in England the first and most eager to fan the flame of passion which led to the disgraceful scenes which in 1780 desolated London"? It must not be inferred, however, that Wesley gave any incentive to his followers to engage in riot, though he often spoke of Roman Catholics as if in religious belief they were practically pagans. "The principles of the Church of Rome 'have a natural tendency to hinder, if not utterly destroy, the love of God.' . . . 'No Romanist can expect to be saved according to the terms of his covenant.'"

AUTHORITIES.—The Thorntons figure largely in Sir J. Stephen's *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, some of which deal with the men forming the Clapham Sect. For William Wilberforce, see *Life* by his sons, 3 vols. 1839, and J. C. Colquhoun's *William Wilberforce, his Friends and his Times*, 1866. The Cowper literature is endless. Read the monograph by Goldwin Smith in English Men of Letters Series, and Cowper's *Letters*, published under the editorship of Thomas Wright, 4 vols. 1904. Hutchinsonianism may be

seen, in addition to the works cited in the text, in *An Abstract from the Works of John Hutchinson, being a Summary of his Discoveries in Philosophy and Divinity*, 2nd ed. corrected, 1755; *The Integrity of the Hebrew Text and many Passages of Scripture vindicated from the Objections and Misconstructions of Mr. Kennicott*, by Julius Bate, 1754; *Remarks upon Dr. Benson's Sermon on the Gospel Method of Justification*, by Julius Bate, 1758; *The First Principles of Philosophy*, 1748; *The Creation the Groundwork of Revelation and Revelation the Language of Nature*, 1750; *The Theology and Philosophy in Cicero's "Somnium Scipionis" explained, or a Brief Attempt to demonstrate that the Newtonian System is perfectly agreeable to the Notions of the Wisest Ancients, and that Mathematical Principles are the only Sure Ones* (by Bishop Horne?), 1750 (this, of course, is a reply); *The Blessing of Judah by Jacob considered: The Aera of Daniel's Weeks ascertained*, by Julius Bate, 1753; *Micah* v. 2 *and Matt.* ii. 6 *reconciled; with some Remarks on Dr. Hunt's Latin Oration at Oxford*, 1748, *and Dr. Grey's "Last Words of David," and David's numbering the People*, by Julius Bate, 1749; *The Use and Intent of Prophecy, and History of the Fall cleared from the Objections in Dr. C. Middleton's Examination of the Bishop of London's Discourses concerning Them*, by Julius Bate, 1750; *A Defence of Mr. Hutchinson's Tenets in Philosophy and Divinity, in Answer to the Objections of Mr. Berrington*, by Julius Bate, 1751; *Remarks upon Mr. Warburton's "Remarks," tending to show that the Ancients knew that there was a Future State; and that the Jews were not under an Equal Providence*, by Julius Bate, 1745; *Remarks on Dr. Sharp's Pieces on the words Elohim and Berith*, by Benjamin Holloway, 1751; *The Evidence for Christianity contained in the Hebrew words Aleim and Berit*, by James Moody, 1752. Consult also the articles in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* Reference should be made to Hutchinson's own *Works*, 12 vols.

FOURTH PERIOD, 1789–1800

CHAPTER XIV

GENERAL INFLUENCES—THE GROWTH OF TOLERATION

THE present period only embraces twelve years, but they were extremely important years in the Church's history. It is a curious fact that the eighteenth century begins and ends with brief periods of great activity, roughly speaking of about the same length, on each side of a long period of stagnation. But it should be added that the first active period began long before the first years, and the second lasted long after the close, of the eighteenth century. The change which marked the closing years of the century is due to a variety of causes, by far the most important of which was the influence of the French Revolution in England. The influence may be seen writ large in the revulsion of conduct it created in one of the noblest spirits and one of the most splendid intellects which the eighteenth century ever produced. Up to 1789 Edmund Burke (1729-1797) had been the courageous and consistent friend of the oppressed in all quarters of the world. He had been virtually the trainer of the liberal leader, Charles James Fox, who said that he owed more to Burke than to any living man. He had been on the side of toleration for all who accepted the broad outlines of the Christian faith, strongly supporting the Bill for the relief of Protestant dissenters in 1773, and equally strongly the Bill for the relaxation of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics in 1778. He

Edmund Burke.

persistently strove to redress the grievances of his poor countrymen, the Irish, who were, he thought, harshly treated by the dominant faction. He advocated with all the warmth and vehemence of his nature the cause of the natives of India against Warren Hastings, whom he regarded, rightly or wrongly, as a corrupt tyrant whose oppressions tarnished the British rule. In 1780 he made an attempt to mitigate the evils of the slave trade; in 1788 he declared in Parliament that he desired its total abolition, and in 1789 praised highly the speech with which William Wilberforce introduced his resolutions on the subject.

In short, up to 1789, he had always lent his powerful aid to the cause of liberty, so far, that is, as he could do so consistently with his strong churchmanship, which was far more enlightened than that of most of his contemporaries. But he always drew the line at infidelity, was not friendly towards the dissenters, had no sympathy with the clergy who desired relief from subscription to the Church's formularies, and opposed therefore the Feathers' Tavern petition in 1772. These very intelligible limitations to his liberalism should be borne in mind in judging the opinions that he formed in 1789, and which he eagerly inculcated during the remaining eight years of his life. His inconsistency was apparent rather than real. He foresaw sooner and more clearly than most men what the results of the French Revolution would be. "I am for liberty," he said, "but for liberty only in the guise of order"; and he foresaw in its early stages that the French Revolution meant disorder, and disorder in that which he ever regarded as the highest region of all, the region of religion. So while others, with whom he had hitherto acted, were sympathising with the French people, Burke saw the real drift of the movement and acted accordingly. Though a true friend of the people, he was never an anarchist; though a true friend of toleration, he was ever a sworn foe of irreligion.

Was he wrong in thinking that anarchy and irreligion would be the result of the great upheaval in France, and in fearing that the shock would be felt in England also? At any rate, he did think and fear this from the autumn of 1789, and the intensity of his conviction grew as the movement developed. Accordingly, in

Burke and the French Revolution.

March 1790, when his friend and disciple, Charles James Fox, proposed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Burke spoke against the motion which he had formerly supported, on the ground that "it was not a time to weaken the safeguards of the Established Church"; and eight months later appeared his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, the effects of which were immediate and far-reaching. The little book passed through eleven editions within a year, and of course affected different people in different ways. The Whigs were filled with dismay, as it implied the defection of a shining light from their party; and one of their chief men, Sir James Mackintosh, answered it in April 1791, by his *Vindiciae Gallicae*, the efficiency of which is discounted by the fact that in 1800 the writer entirely recanted its sentiments, declaring that he now "abhorred, abjured, and for ever renounced the French Revolution, with all its sanguinary history, its abominable principles, and for ever execrable leaders, and hoped to be able to wipe off the disgrace of having been once betrayed into an approbation of that conspiracy against God and man."

Burke was also answered by Thomas Paine in *The Rights of Man*, but that book helped rather than hindered the acceptance of Burke's doctrines among those who valued Christianity. Burke could not have had a better ally than Paine, whose vindication of the French Revolution was the best proof that Burke's theory of its tendency was correct. Paine's book had an enormous circulation, and was vigorously pushed by the societies which had been formed to spread the doctrines of the Revolution. The work is clever, daring, and trenchant, but shallow. He treated prescription as being merely an unreasonable prejudice, and therefore not capable of being regarded as a sound basis for the existing social order. Government could only be by election or by hereditary succession, and Paine dismissed the idea of heredity in government as inherently absurd. There was nothing in the nature of things to justify a man being a ruler simply because he was his father's son. Only election could secure the wisest rulers. The alternative method might secure the most stupid. It led, moreover, to a claim on the part of the rulers to be irresponsible, and Paine keenly thrust the point home: "A

body of men holding themselves accountable to nobody ought to be trusted by nobody." Let there therefore be an end of monarchy and let the representative system, which was more in accordance with the order and immutable laws of nature, take its rightful place as more consonant with the reason of man. These doctrines were eagerly read by the poorer and uneducated classes and their influence was widely felt. Nor was Burke wrong in supposing that the contagion would spread beyond France. A flood of infidel literature poured into England, appealing for the most part to the lower classes, who were ill prepared to resist the torrent. But it was not only among the masses that the French Revolution was at first regarded with favour. Almost all that young band of poets and men of letters who a few years later were destined to make the early part of the nineteenth century the most brilliant period of English literature next to the Elizabethan, regarded it at first not only with equanimity but with hopefulness, indeed with intense enthusiasm. The growing influence of the Evangelical revival in both its sections was all thrown into the Anti-Revolutionary scale. William Wilberforce who, in recognition of his efforts against the Slave trade, received in 1792 the doubtful honour of French citizenship in the doubtful company of Paine, Bentham, and others, was stimulated by the compliment to become a pronounced anti-Jacobin. Hannah More (1745-1833) did good service to the Anti-Revolutionary cause by publishing her *Village Politics*, which rivalled in circulation if not in influence Paine's *Rights of Man*, as an antidote to which the tracts were written. She was a popular writer, and her other works were all in this same direction. The Methodists were all on the same side, and did something to balance the influence in an opposite direction among the lower classes. Their great leader, who had just gone to his rest, had effectually impressed the lesson of order and religion upon his followers.

Hannah More.

One result of this reaction was to increase immensely the power and reputation of the Church, which was justly regarded as the strongest bulwark against the incursion of French principles. Burke had largely contributed to this feeling in his *Reflections*, in which some of the most magnificent passages were on what would now be called Church Defence. But

though it was a good thing in itself to rally round "the Altar and the Throne," it may be doubted whether the influence of the French Revolution upon the English Church was altogether beneficial. In the first place, it certainly tended to widen the breach between it and the dissenters. The progress of toleration received a severe check from which it did not recover for many years.

As a general rule, though a rule with many exceptions, dissenters were for, and the Church against the revolutionary spirit, while the popular feeling was strongly in favour of the Church and against the spirit of revolt. At a very early stage of the Revolution this was marked by the Birmingham riots of 1791, which were only less mischievous than the London riots of 1780 in proportion as Birmingham is a smaller place than London. Birmingham was the residence of Dr. Priestley (1733-1804), an ardent admirer of the French Revolution. He was a Unitarian minister who is now best remembered as the discoverer of oxygen. The Revolution Society in Birmingham, of which Priestley was a prominent member, announced a meeting for July 14, to commemorate the anniversary of the taking of the Bastille, and a few days before the meeting a handbill containing a seditious attack upon the King and the Government was widely disseminated. Priestley, it appears, was not present at the celebration, and had nothing to do with it. But his name being closely associated with the Society, the rioters destroyed the two Unitarian meeting-houses in Birmingham, and burnt Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and scientific apparatus. Priestley owned that the clergy had no concern in the riot, but he charged them with having contributed to raise the spirit which produced it. Dr. Parr, who appears to have been sincerely anxious to promote peace, wrote to the dissenters in May 1792: "Those whom you suppose, whether justly or unjustly, to be your enemies have instituted a Society under the appellation of the 'Church and King' Club. I hope not one member of the club can seriously wish to see your persons again in danger or your houses in flames. But you know the cry of 'Church and King' has been lately heard in broken and indistinct murmurs, and if you meet again to commemorate

Priestley Riots.

the French Revolution, that cry will again thunder in your ears, when the storm of public indignation is collected to one point."

On the other hand, the bitterness against Rome was much mitigated owing to the immigration of the persecuted clergy from France to England, where they were most generously treated even by those who had the greatest horror of popery. But this did not in the end help, or even tend to help, the cause of Christian unity. It was felt, and not without reason, that the more friendly and grateful these distressed strangers were for their kind treatment, the more strongly would they regard it to be their bounden duty to bring their benefactors into the one true Church. Again, that solidity and stability of the Church which caused people to regard it as a tower of strength against the innovating principles of France had a tendency to discourage all changes even for the better. It is true that earnest men tried to make churchmen bestir themselves and be up and doing. Thus Bishop Porteus strove to improve the occasion in his charge to the London clergy: "There never was, I will venture to say, in the history of this island, a single period in which the personal residence and personal exertions of the parochial clergy were ever more wanted, or more anxiously looked up to, and expected and demanded by the general voice of the whole nation, than at this moment; in order to fortify the faith, and to sanctify the manners of the great mass of the people." Again he says: "When we know that in other countries schools of irreligion have actually been established, and children regularly trained up, almost from their infancy, in the alphabet and grammar of infidelity: when we know, too, that the utmost efforts have been made, and are now making, here to shake the faith of the lower orders of the people, and to render Christianity an object of contempt and abhorrence to them: surely it behoves us to counteract and to guard against these attempts by every means in our power; and more especially by diffusing as widely as possible among the children of the poor the opportunities afforded by Sunday schools of acquiring the soundest principles and the earliest habits of morality and religion." Arguments of this kind, men

The French immigrants.

Bishop Porteus.

felt, were all very well, but they savoured of reform; and the borderland between reform and revolution was easily crossed; so they would have no reform lest it should lead to revolution. There was a suspicion even against so apparently innocent an institution as Sunday schools, lest Jacobinical principles should unwaringly be admitted into them. Apart from the Evangelical movement, anything like a Church revival did not begin until the eighteenth century was well ended, when all fear of the revolutionary spirit had quite evaporated. The excesses and blasphemies of the French Revolution had not been without their effect upon the minds of thoughtful and religious men in England. They naturally asked themselves what was there in the national Church here that could stave off a similar outbreak. They were conscious of the removal of some of the evils of the Church life of the earlier part of the century, and of the distinct improvement in moral tone of the people at large. They were aware of a good deal of sporadic revival here and there, but as yet they had not recognised the crying need of systematic and far-seeing concerted action by means of which to uplift and purify the masses of the people. Little or nothing was being done for education. No new churches were being built. No missionary spirit was exhibited.

Effect in England of French Revolution,

To go back a little earlier than the present period, the American War of Independence had had a softening effect upon the minds of English people. Although to a small extent compensated by the acquisition of Canada from the French, yet the loss of the American colonies and all that that involved was very serious. They had been acquired and maintained by a large expenditure of money and of life. Their people were very largely of our own flesh and blood, and the loss of them was attributed by many to the fault of the Government at home. It was the first important check received by our colonising instinct, and naturally caused men to pause and think. A favourable opportunity was therefore given by these two events to those who were disposed to better things to impress the minds of the people with reference to evils that were endangering the well-being and safety of the land.

of War of Independence.

Gambling had been very prevalent up to the outbreak of

the war. The highest play ever known to Fox, for example, he dated between 1772 and the beginning of the outbreak. Attempts were made to check it by legislation, and in 1797 some ladies of fashion were fined for gambling. Private lotteries had been prohibited, but public lotteries were still legal. A law was, however, passed in 1778 reducing the number of dealers in lottery tickets in England to fifty-one, and remedying some of the abuses of the system. But it was more by the sobering of public opinion than by legal enactment that the number of gamblers was reduced and the amounts staked diminished. The Court had set the example. In 1764 hazard on Twelfth Night was discontinued at Court and gaming forbidden in the royal palaces.

Gambling.

Sunday observance began to be more strict and general, partly on account of the influence of the Methodist and Evangelical revival; and it increased still more later under the alarm produced by the French Revolution. Sunday parties and entertainments were discontinued. An Act was passed in 1780 to suppress Sunday debating societies. A tax was proposed upon Sunday papers, and Wilberforce organised a society after the fashion of the Caroline societies for the Reformation of Manners, in order to enforce the existing laws "against the profanation of the Sabbath," and to support the magistrates in their endeavours to secure the due observance of the day.

Sunday observance.

Duelling also began to be looked upon with disapprobation, though public opinion was more difficult to move than in the former cases. Even so stern a moralist as Dr. Johnson had defended it, therein illustrating the then state of public opinion; as did also Bentham, though he pointed out its inherent absurdity and consequent evils. But Paley and others as strongly condemned it, and it is due to their influence that there was only a brief period to elapse before its final disappearance early in the nineteenth century.

Duelling.

The same sobering influence is seen in the change in the dress both of men and women. The French Revolution, with its doctrine of equality, soon made its impression on the world of fashion in England. Economic causes partly account for the change. Men were feeling the awful stress of the war, especially in 1797, and were com-

Dress.

pelled to husband their resources. Wigs and swords disappeared, and a style of dress characterised by extreme simplicity set in. The gay colours of the former age were superseded by the greys and browns and black of the later years of the century. Their note, a special note of the Evangelical school, was seriousness, and to be serious became no longer a cause for ridicule.

As regards religious toleration throughout our periods; the Roman Catholic was under the most severe restrictions. He could not hold any public office under the Government nor in a city nor corporation. He was forbidden the army and navy and the bar. He had not the right to sit in Parliament. He had no right to vote either for representative peers or for members of the House of Commons. He had to pay a double land-tax. In 1791 a further measure of relief was granted. In 1788 a committee of English Roman Catholics memorialised Pitt, stating their grievances and pleading for relief. On Pitt's advice they collected evidence as to the opinions of official Roman Catholics and of Catholic universities concerning the existence and extent of the dispensing power of the Pope, and subsequently acting on the evidence thus obtained, a large number of English Catholics, including the four Vicars-Apostolic and almost the whole body of the Catholic clergy in England, signed a protestation which was presented to Parliament along with their petition for relief. The drift of the protestation was to the effect that there was nothing in Roman Catholicism necessarily hostile to the civil power in a Protestant country. It declined to acknowledge any infallibility in the Pope, and stated that "the Catholic Church has no power over Protestants except that of excluding them from its sacraments and other religious privileges; no jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within this realm, that can directly or indirectly affect or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, constitution, or government thereof, or the rights, liberties, persons, or properties of the people." The Relief Bill passed the Commons without a division, and it only received one modification in the Lords, somewhat simplifying the

The Protestation.

Relief Bill, 1791.

form of the oath which was henceforward to be taken by Roman Catholics. It removed some disabilities, admitting them to the legal profession from the rank of barrister downwards. It granted a legal toleration to the Roman worship and schools, and it abolished the necessity which had hitherto been imposed upon Catholics of enrolling their deeds and wills. They were also relieved from the obligation of taking the oath of Supremacy and the declaration against Transubstantiation. Peers who had not taken the oath and declaration were no longer forbidden access to the King's presence. On the other hand, all chapels and schools, and the names of all officiating priests and schoolmasters, were to be registered. No Catholic assembly could be held with locked doors. No chapel was to have a steeple or a bell. The priests were forbidden to wear their habits or perform any service in the open air, or anywhere except in authorised buildings, or in private houses in which not more than five persons, in addition to the household, were present. Protestant children were not to be admitted to any Catholic school. The monastic orders were prohibited, and endowment of any school or college was forbidden. The Act was welcomed on all sides, and no popular disturbance followed.

Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act of 1753 exempted Jews and Quakers from the otherwise universal law requiring all marriages to be celebrated by priests in Anglican orders and according to the English liturgy. In other respects the status of both Jews and Quakers was legally unaffected during our period, though attempts were made, especially in the case of the Jews, to mitigate their wrongs. In the case of the dissenters, in 1718 the Schism Act, which restricted their education, and the Occasional Conformity Act, intended to restrict their political power, were both repealed, though a clause was added to the repealing Act in the latter instance providing that no mayor or bailiff or other magistrate should attend a meeting-house with the ensigns of office, under pain of being disqualified from holding any public office. Although Parliament declined to repeal the Test Act, which was, indeed, not repealed till 1828, yet it mitigated some of the penal consequences by a series of In-

Quakers and Jews.

Dissenters.

Indemnity Acts.

demnity Acts, beginning with the first in 1727. These Acts professed only to relieve those who, "through ignorance of the law, absence, or unavoidable accident," had omitted to qualify, and applied only to those who were actually holding office or in corporations. An attempt was made in 1773 to substitute for subscription on the part of dissenters a declaration to the effect that they were Christians, and that they took the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the rule of their faith and practice; but the opposition of the bishops caused the Dissenters' Relief Bill to be rejected by a large majority. It was, however, passed in 1779. Many and persistent attempts were made during the closing years of the century to secure the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, but without success. The dread of revolutionary principles was so great that the motion of C. J. Fox in the House of Commons in 1790 on the question was defeated by no less than 294 to 105, while Lord Stanhope's comprehensive Toleration Bill of 1789 never reached the Commons at all.

Dissenters' Relief Bill, 1779.

Two prominent clerical writers of the time dealt with the policy of maintaining religious disabilities. Bishop Warburton in 1739 had published his book on the *Alliance of Church and State*, in which he regards all tests and penal enactments not in the light of punishments for conscientious scruples as to matters of faith, but as necessary safeguards for the welfare of the Established Church as the institution responsible for the religious and moral well-being of the national life. Church and State were one on the basis of a social compact, and if the union and the usefulness of both were to be maintained, the State must interfere to uphold the integrity of the Church. The atmosphere becomes much clearer in the second writer who treats of the question. Paley, in his *Moral and Political Philosophy*, which appeared in 1785, impugns the Test and Corporation Acts because they were not consistent with perfect toleration, because they were stumbling-blocks in the path of the pursuit of truth, and only to be justified on the ground of utility, if such could be found. He denies further that such ground existed. The Church will be always strong enough to

Bishop Warburton on "Church and State."

Paley on "Establishment."

maintain itself if it continues to hold the allegiance of a majority of the people. He went further and laid it down that if ever the dissenters became a majority, the Established Church ought to be altered or modified, and he pleaded for a policy of concurrent endowment.

AUTHORITIES.—For Edmund Burke's career the best authorities are Prior's *Life of Burke*, *The Public and Domestic Life of Edmund Burke*, by Peter Burke, and John Morley's *Burke* in the English Men of Letters series, to which should be added the articles in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. There are some thoughtful essays on Burke also in Sir James Stephen's *Horae Sabbaticae*. For the French Revolution refer to *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. viii. *Memoirs of Hannah More*, by W. Roberts, 1836, and *Life of Hannah More*, by H. Thompson, 1836, are full and accurate. The career of Bishop Beilby Porteus is sketched in the *Life* prefixed to the collected edition of his *Works*, 1836. The history of the growth of Toleration will be found at length in Lecky, *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*.

CHAPTER XV

THE LATER EVANGELICALS

THE French Revolution certainly affected the Evangelicals in more ways than one. It drew them closer to the Church and it drew the Church closer to them. In their earlier history their churchmanship was of a rather vague kind. Henry Venn used to attend the Independent meetings at Huddersfield. John Newton was quite as ready, so far as principle was concerned, to enter the dissenting as the Church ministry. Grimshaw himself built a Methodist chapel almost under the very shadow of his own church at Haworth. John Thornton had no scruple about attending nonconformist services, nor had William Wilberforce in the first period of his religious life. Lady Huntingdon built a college which was to all intents and purposes an institution for the training of dissenting ministers. Whitefield, though an ordained clergyman, can hardly be called a churchman in any intelligible sense of the term, and it is frankly acknowledged that he was in a false position. But all this, as we have seen, was in the earlier stages of the movement. The French Revolution completed the drawing of a distinct line, which other events had begun to draw, between those who did and those who did not belong to the Church of England. Lady Huntingdon in 1781 had registered her chapels as dissenting places of worship, and henceforth it was almost impossible, to use the racy words of Bishop Beilby Porteus, for a clergyman "to divide himself between the Church of England and the Church of Lady Huntingdon." Three years later John Wesley, by setting apart Dr. Coke and Francis Ashbury, committed an

act of schism, and hence arose a clearer line of demarcation between the Evangelicals and the Arminian Methodists.

The Evangelicals were drawn closer and closer to the Church. They felt, in common with others who shrank with horror from the anti-Christian views of the Revolutionists, that the Church was the strongest barrier against the spread of such views in England, and hence they became strong churchmen, in their way, almost to a man. Though they were still perversely called Methodists by many, their position began to be a little better understood by the Church at large. At any rate, individuals among them were recognised as allies, no longer as enemies.

The Clapham Sect.

These points are illustrated by what took place at one of the chief Evangelical centres. What is called "The Clapham Sect" can hardly be said to have been formed until the period at which we have now arrived. There had been individual Evangelicals at Clapham, but they were not the united body they soon afterwards became. Their recognised leader, William Wilberforce, did not join the Evangelicals until 1785, and did not come to reside at Clapham till 1792, when he occupied apartments in the house of Henry Thornton at Battersea Rise. He entered public life early. In 1787, eight years after he had been elected member for Hull, Hannah More spoke of him as "an extraordinary young gentleman for talent and piety"; and he was still quite young when he became virtually the leader of the Clapham Sect, which included Henry Thornton, Zachary Macaulay, James Stephen, Charles Grant, E. B. Elliott, and a little later Lord Teignmouth, with their families. These were all regular worshippers at Clapham church, where John Venn, the like-minded son of the Evangelical leader, Henry Venn, was Rector for more than twenty years (1792-1813). Thackeray, in his otherwise admirable sketch of the Evangelical lady's household at Clapham in *The Newcomes*, makes a great mistake in representing the members of it as going off to different dissenting places of worship, and only the "worldly" Tom Newcome and his son as attending the church. The typical Claphamites would all go to church. One of the most typical households, by the way, was, like that of the Newcomes, a rich banker's. The term "sect"

is also a little misleading. They did not "follow" any one in religion except their own parish priest, whom their leader in works of piety and charity, William Wilberforce, always consulted. There is a vivid picture of Clapham church drawn by one who knew it well, a few years later, but applicable *mutatis mutandis* to the scene it would present in the last decade of the eighteenth century. "On Sunday they (the Thorntons) sit in the old church, with the Wilberforces' and Macaulays' and Stephens' pews close to their own, and in the front gallery the Teignmouths', and listen to the wise discourse of Venn, or sit enchanted under the preaching of Gisborne."

The last-named was only a visitor, but, owing to his intimate friendship with Wilberforce, which dated from their college days, he was probably a frequent visitor. His home was at Yoxall Lodge in Staffordshire, where he was partly squire and partly parson, undertaking the perpetual curacy of Barton-under-Needwood hard by, where Wilberforce frequently visited. He was unquestionably a man of culture and piety, and had a great reputation both as a writer and a preacher. The appearance of a new volume by Thomas Gisborne (1758-1846), we are told, was hailed by Hannah More as a spiritual and intellectual treat; and Sir James Stephen, who as a boy had probably often heard him at Clapham, says of his writings and preaching: "He contributed largely to the formation of the national mind on subjects of the highest importance to the national character. He was the expositor of the 'Evangelical' system to those cultivated or fastidious readers who were intolerant of the ruder style of his less refined brethren. He addressed them as a poet, as a moralist, as a natural philosopher, and as a divine. . . . His literary fame, if indeed it shall endure the competitions of a later age, must rest on his sermons. They were regarded by his contemporaries as models in a style of composition in which the English language has scarcely a single specimen of excellence. . . . He approached more nearly than any Anglican clergyman of his time towards the ideal of that much neglected art." Unfortunately his works, which were rather voluminous, are still extant, and it must be confessed that they are, especially the sermons,

Thomas Gisborne.

rather disappointing. Other competent judges, however, such as Alexander Knox, Reginald Heber, and Henry Thornton, seem to estimate him about as highly as Stephen did. But the fact is, that none of the Evangelicals were at their best with the pen in their hands. Perhaps the most popular and influential of all their works were written at the time and in the place with which we are now immediately concerned. In 1797 William Wilberforce, very hesitatingly, and with little encouragement from his publishers, gave to the world his famous *Practical View*, the full title of which is *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious Systems of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with Real Christianity.* "The main object," to quote the author's own words, "which he had in view was, not to convince the sceptic or to answer the arguments of persons who avowedly oppose the fundamental doctrines of our religion, but to point out the scanty and erroneous system of the bulk of those who belong to the class of orthodox Christians, and to contrast their defective scheme with a representation of what the author apprehended to be real Christianity." The work was one that the age needed. Men had been thrown back upon the old faith because of the terrible results of scepticism which the French Revolution had brought home to them. They now accepted the Christian creed but they did not live the Christian life, and so the immediate effect of Wilberforce's book was extraordinary. Cadell, the publisher, at first ventured to print only 500 copies. Within six months 7500 had been sold. Fifteen editions had been published in England by 1824, and twenty-five in America. Translations were made into French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, and German. It still remains as the typical manifesto of the Evangelical party, and is by no means out of date—in fact it has been recently republished.

Wilberforce's *Practical View*

Wilberforce, it will be seen, took very much the same line as William Law took in the *Serious Call* seventy years before. "Live the life" was the burden of both, and in the seventy years' interval between the publication of their books no other had anything like the same influence. But if we compare the two frankly and critically there can be no question that in point of style, argument, and intellectual capacity generally the

comparison is infinitely in favour of the earlier book. This has been the verdict of posterity. The *Serious Call* still lives and is still being frequently reprinted. The *Practical View* has now comparatively few readers. It does not deserve this fate, for its lessons are still needed in this age of riches and luxury. But the writer had hardly intellectual grasp enough to hold the minds of men. His name is enshrined for ever in the memory and hearts of his countrymen, but it is on account of his practical work, not of his *Practical View*.

And this brings us to what was, after all, the superlative merit of the Clapham Sect, their practical work. That work was only in mid-course when this period closes, but it had already given rich promise of the abundant fruit it was soon about to bear. Let us begin with the abolition of the slave trade. It is by no means intended to claim for the men of Clapham the sole credit of the great struggle of national self-sacrifice in behalf of justice and humanity, in short of Christian charity. They were nobly aided by many who had no sympathy with their religious views. They cannot, strictly speaking, be said even to have started the movement. If there is one individual to whom that honour belongs, it is Granville Sharp, who has rightly been called "the father of the movement," and Granville Sharp was not a Claphamite. Neither, of course, were the good Quakers who formed the majority of the original members of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, which was founded in 1787. Neither was Bishop Porteus, who threw all the weight of his office and his high personal reputation into the scale; nor Bishop Watson, nor Archdeacon Paley. Neither was Thomas Clarkson, who took up the cause even from his college days, and never ceased to labour indefatigably in it until the edifice was crowned by the abolition not only of the slave trade, but of slavery. Neither was Pitt, nor Fox, nor Burke, nor Brougham. But, making every allowance for the services which others rendered, it must still be admitted that Wilberforce, aided by his Clapham friends Thornton and Macaulay and Stephen, was the real mainspring of the movement; and if the Clapham Sect had done nothing else, this work alone would have rendered that body immortal. But they did very much else. It was very largely through their influence that

Abolition of slave trade.

the Church Missionary Society was founded and placed upon the excellent business footing which it has always since maintained, as will be described in a future chapter. Little as well as great ways of doing good received their effective support. "Schools, prison discipline, savings banks, tracts, village libraries, district visitings, and church buildings, each for a time rivalled their cosmopolitan projects. Every human interest had its guardian, every region of the globe its representative."

Church Missionary Society.

As, however, the full fruit of their labours did not appear until the eighteenth century was closed, we must not enter further into details. But one word must be added in conclusion. The Clapham Sect very wisely abstained from plunging into work for which they were not well qualified, and devoted themselves to work to which they were thoroughly equal. Supposing, for instance, that they had revived the Calvinistic Controversy, which had happily fallen into abeyance, or had indulged in profound speculations in print on unfulfilled prophecies, or the Millennium, as some Evangelicals unwisely did, they would probably not have done anything particularly valuable. But they knew the limits of their own powers. They exercised talents and qualifications which they possessed, without attempting works requiring talents and qualifications to which they could lay no claim. They were men of business, and they devoted their business capacities to the noblest of all purposes. Wilberforce contributed his wonderfully persuasive eloquence, his social influence, his connexion with men of the world of all sorts; Thornton his knowledge of affairs; Stephen his legal acumen; Zachary Macaulay his organising powers; John Venn his sanctified common-sense. They were more or less men of wealth, and they regarded that wealth as literally a talent to be employed in the Master's use; and, what was perhaps of hardly less importance, a talent to make the most of, as only business men could do.

Characteristics of the Clapham Sect.

But we must not forget that there were other places besides Clapham; for the Evangelical movement spread rapidly far and wide during the twelve years this period embraces. Let us first take a short step from Clapham to London, for the capital was naturally a great centre of

the party. When John Newton came to London in 1780, he found only one other Evangelical incumbent there. This was of course, William Romaine, who had entered upon the career of a London clergyman as early as 1748, though he was not beneficed until 1766, when, as we have already seen, he became Rector of St. Anne's, Blackfriars. For fourteen years he was the sole incumbent in the City who preached the doctrines of the revival. There is something very striking in the thought of this one solitary figure rising up like another John the Baptist in the moral wilderness of London, and proclaiming, not for a brief space, but Sunday after Sunday for fourteen long years, what he believed to be vital but long-neglected truths; and the stern, reserved, self-contained character of the man adds force and vividness to the picture. But, like John the Baptist, he had his encouragement. If it cannot be quite said of him as it was said of St. John, "There went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan," yet his church was always crowded and he was certainly the leading Evangelical clergyman in London. He never seems to have lost his hold upon the people, for at last when he died in 1795 at an advanced old age, "his body was borne to Blackfriars through a dense crowd, the City marshals preceding it on horseback, and nearly fifty private coaches following." At length in 1780 two other incumbents joined him who became equally prominent as leaders of the Evangelical cause, and who possessed some qualifications for the office which he did not. There was evidently a demand for Evangelical clergy, and the supply followed.

William Romaine.

John Newton was not at all what we should expect a popular preacher to be. His printed sermons are full of truth, very earnest, very sensible, and now and then show glimpses of a dry but dignified and restrained humour, not out of place even in a pulpit, but there is nothing exciting or sensational, nothing that can be called eloquence. They gained no advantage from their oral delivery, for his utterance was not clear and his gestures were sometimes grotesque. Yet his church was soon crowded by strangers as well as parishioners, and the congregations continued to be very large until his death. In the same year, 1780, the refined and cultured Richard Cecil became

John Newton.

incumbent of St. John's, Bedford Row, in the parish of St. Andrew's, Holborn, which at once became a large Evangelical centre and long remained so. Cecil was far more gifted than either Romaine or Newton for the post of a leading London clergyman. He had the culture without the reserve of the former, and the geniality without the ruggedness of the latter. These were great lights shining each in his respective sphere. But among the lesser fires there soon arose many that burned very brightly.

Richard Cecil.

In 1785 Thomas Scott followed his friend and master, John Newton, to London, acting as joint-chaplain at the Lock Hospital, and holding various lectureships. Scott was even less calculated than Newton to be a popular preacher, but he bore, or at least soon made for himself, a distinguished name by his *Commentary*, which he began in 1788 and finished in 1792, while his piety and sturdy honesty of purpose would have made him a credit to any cause. His brother-chaplain at the Lock, Charles Edward de Coetlogon, was no doubt a much more popular preacher, and was a tower of strength to the Evangelical cause in London both by his pulpit eloquence and by his writings, some of which were sermons, others devotional or controversial treatises, all written in the interests of the Evangelical cause; he also edited in the same interest for five years (1784-1789) *The Theological Miscellany, a Review of Books on Religious Subjects.*

Thomas Scott.

Another very estimable clergyman of the Evangelical school was Basil Woodd (1760-1831), who was incumbent of the Bentinck chapel in the parish of Marylebone during the whole of our period and for many years later (1785-1831). It was not at all inconsistent with his position as an Evangelical that he worked his parish on distinctly Church lines, laying much stress on the Fasts and Festivals of the Church, on the duty of public catechising in church, and of supporting the old Church Societies, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. He was always regarded as one of the "serious" clergy, and did good service to the Evangelicals in a direction in which they perhaps rather needed it, namely, that of definite churchmanship.

Basil Woodd.

A still more prominent person was Henry Foster, the friend and assistant-curate of William Romaine, and afterwards the intimate associate of Richard Cecil. In 1795 two young clergymen, who afterwards became leaders of the cause, began their ministerial career in London, Josiah Pratt (1768-1844) as assistant to Cecil at St. John's, Bedford Row, and William Goode, father of the Dean of Ripon, who died in 1868, to William Romaine at St. Anne's, Blackfriars; but they had hardly come into note before the century ended. It is impossible to enumerate the clergy in London who were beginning to join more or less definitely the Evangelical ranks. No doubt one reason which attracted them was the countenance which was given to the movement by the bishop of the diocese. Dr. Beilby Porteus, who received translation from Chester to London in 1787; for though the bishop did not exactly identify himself with the Evangelical cause, he showed it far more favour than any other prelate had ever yet done, and he had the warmest sympathy with many of the leading Evangelicals. He clearly perceived, what the episcopal mind as a rule was slow to grasp, that Methodism and Evangelicalism were not the same thing, and he never thought it necessary, as most of his episcopal brethren did, to mix the two up in a most provoking way in his charges. It was not so much the doctrines of the Evangelicals—for he was markedly anti-Calvinistic—as their self-devotion and practical activity that attracted him. A worker and a reformer himself, he was inclined to sympathise with all good work and all reform which was not clearly off the lines. To Wilberforce, Hannah More, and others he was a most valuable coadjutor, and the mere weight of his name and office did much to render the party "respectable." But it would be misleading to dwell longer on him in this connexion; for he was not, properly speaking, an Evangelical, and he will be treated of at some length when we come to the leading prelates of the period.

Let us pass on to what were really more important centres for any religious movement than even London itself—Oxford and Cambridge, which were, far more exclusively than at the present day, the training-grounds of the future clergy—"rivers," as John Wesley said, "to make glad the city of

God." How then did the Evangelical cause fare at the two great universities? At Oxford, the original home of the whole movement, it fared very badly indeed. The mere fact that its chief centre in that university was St. Edmund Hall speaks volumes. St. Edmund Hall is an ancient, interesting, and respectable little foundation; but it is a little one, and it was apparently quite large enough to receive most of the Evangelicals who desired to avail themselves of an Oxford training, and even in the humble shades of this little hall they were not allowed to rest in peace. It was from St. Edmund Hall that the six Methodist students had been expelled in 1768, and after that it is not surprising that Oxford was not often chosen by Evangelicals as their university. The *genius loci* was against them. The spirit which led men to become Jacobites, and which lingered on at Oxford long after it had evaporated elsewhere, was very different from that which led men to become Methodists. With the exception of Dr. Dixon and Dr. Crouch, successive principals of St. Edmund Hall, there were practically no Oxford residents who were Evangelicals until after the eighteenth century closed.

Evangelicals at Oxford.

Oxford and the Evangelicals.

It was far otherwise with Cambridge, which from the beginning of the Evangelical (as distinguished from the Methodist) movement was the chosen home of many Evangelicals of the more intellectual type. In the last twelve years of the eighteenth century there were on the foundation of different colleges Isaac Milner, Charles Simeon, Joseph Jowett, William Farish, William Dealtry; while among non-resident Cambridge men were Joseph Milner, William Wilberforce, John Venn, Thomas Gisborne, Thomas Dykes, Charles Jerram, William Goode—all Evangelicals of distinct eminence; and the only prelate who favoured the movement, Dr. Beilby Porteus, was also a distinguished member of the university. Of these, Isaac Milner has been already noticed; not inferior to him in importance was Charles Simeon.

Evangelicals at Cambridge.

Charles Simeon (1759-1836) is a striking instance of the fact already noticed, that in the eighteenth century religious earnestness, or, to use the expression of the day, "seriousness,"

seemed naturally to gravitate towards the Evangelical party. For the various steps which led to his final conversion would lead us to expect that he would find his spiritual home among the Hornes, the Jones's, the Stevens's, and the Horsleys, not among the Venns, the Newtons, the Thorntons, and the Wilberforces. The *Whole Duty of Man*, "that repository," as Cowper called it, "of self-righteousness and pharisaical lumber," upon which Methodists and Evangelicals, with the exception of John Wesley, looked down with sublime contempt, and which was not "William Law's famous book"; Bishop Wilson on *The Lord's Supper*; John Kettlewell, the Non-Juror, "on the Sacrament"; Archbishop Sharp's *Sermons*; and, above all, *The Book of Common Prayer*, were the books which, next to the Bible, affected him most. He became an Evangelical of the Evangelicals; but we cannot help feeling that, like Wesley, he might, in other circumstances, have taken a different course. As it was, he was sometimes complained of as being more of a Church man than a Gospel man. But the complaint was quite needless. He was an Evangelical through and through: his whole spirit was thoroughly in sympathy with the movement. The subjectivity of it appealed to him; and though he was no ignoramus and no foolish depreciator of human learning, the emotional element in his composition was far stronger than the intellectual. His religion was essentially one of individualism, not of collectivism. He was in his right place in the Evangelical camp. He would have been in the wrong place in, say, that of Jones of Nayland.

Charles Simeon.

The date to which this book is limited precludes us from seeing Simeon at his happiest and his best. His early troubles, the scandalous opposition which was raised against him, the mistakes on his part made through the indiscretion of an impulsive and enthusiastic spirit, which toned down in later years—these belong to the eighteenth century. His triumph over his many difficulties; his wonderful influence not only in his own parish but also in leavening the whole university, even that large part of it which was always contemptuous of him; the beauty of his matured character brought out by the rubbing off of his angularities—those belong to the nineteenth. He

Early difficulties.

was of gentle birth on both sides, and was educated at Eton, whence he proceeded with a scholarship to King's College, Cambridge, in 1779, and was in due course elected Fellow. In 1782 he was ordained on the title of his fellowship before he had reached the canonical age, and while he was still an undergraduate. For a short time he acted as a curate without stipend at St. Edward's church. He made acquaintance with John Venn, then an undergraduate at Sidney Sussex College, and with John Venn's father, Henry Venn, then at Yelling, about twelve miles from Cambridge, and both father and son had a most beneficial influence upon him. The Venns introduced him to John Thornton, and probably also to John Newton, then at St. Mary Woolnoth. So he came within the inner Evangelical circle. At the close of 1782 he was appointed by the Bishop of Ely to the perpetual curacy of Trinity church, Cambridge, before he was in full orders, and there he remained working laboriously for a merely nominal stipend for the rest of his long life.

Trinity church, Cambridge.

His difficulties began at once. His parishioners resented his appointment, desiring that a Mr. Hammond, curate to the late incumbent, should succeed; and when the bishop would not appoint Hammond, they elected him as lecturer, which gave him the right to the pulpit every Sunday afternoon, leaving only the morning to the vicar; and this wretched arrangement went on for twelve years until 1794. Even on the Sunday mornings all the church was not accessible, for by another wretched arrangement the pew-holders could lock their pew-doors, neither filling the seats themselves nor allowing others to do so. So other people, who soon began to flock to the church, were compelled to occupy, as well as they could, the aisles and the remote nooks and corners. Simeon set forms and seats for their accommodation, but the churchwardens pulled them down and threw them into the churchyard. As the pulpit was closed to him in the afternoon, he started, after some months' patient waiting, a Sunday evening lecture at six o'clock, which was largely attended. But the ever irrepressible churchwardens again interfered, shut the church doors and carried off the keys, while the people stood waiting in the street.

From various incidental notices from men who knew him and fully sympathised with his views—such men as, for example, John Thornton, John Newton, Charles Jerram, and Thomas Dykes—we should gather that Simeon was in this his hot youth (he was only twenty-three when he became Vicar of Trinity) more conspicuous for his courage and energy than for his discretion; but there is no definite instance of indiscretion brought against him. He behaved all through these disgraceful proceedings like the thorough Christian and thorough gentleman that he was. The fact that he had no legal remedy against the treatment he received looks almost like an argument for the vitality of the English Church, which could survive a period in which such things were possible. How Simeon himself survived all this opposition, not so much by striving against it as through his well-doing putting to silence the ignorance of foolish men, how he became a great power not only in his own parish but in the university, exercising untold influence for good over "gownsmen" as well as "townsmen," cannot here be related at length; for though the tide began to turn towards the close of the eighteenth century, it was not until the nineteenth that it was in full and perceptible flow. But never should it be forgotten that the very first place in the Evangelical revival at Cambridge, whether in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, belongs to Charles Simeon.

Isaac Milner.

In comparison with him even the great President of Queens' College, Isaac Milner (1750-1820), must be put second; for, in the first place, from 1791 Milner divided his time between Carlisle and Cambridge, and when he was at Cambridge he never exercised, nor attempted to exercise, the personal influence that Simeon did. During the presidentship of Isaac Milner, Queens' was, of course, a stronghold of the cause. "Under the shelter of his name," writes Sir James Stephen, "his college flourished as the best cultured and most fruitful nursery of the Evangelical neophytes at Cambridge." But the description would apply at least as well to Magdalene, which, we are told on very good authority, was in Thomas Dykes's time, from 1786 onward, "the resort of young men seriously impressed with a sense of religion." We can well under-

stand that on that ground it should be preferred even to Queens', for, after all, Milner sat apart in the President's Lodge, and, even if he had wished to do so, could not consistently with the ideas of his time have entered at all closely into the life of the undergraduates; indeed, from a curious entry in Henry Gunning's *Reminiscences*, he appears to have been as much interested in Magdalene as in Queens'. "Among the Moderators and Examiners of that day Milner had," Gunning says, "and continued to have for many years, a prodigious influence, and was frequently called upon to settle the places of men in the higher brackets. . . . Except when a man of his own college or Magdalene was concerned, I do not recollect to have heard any well-founded charge of partiality brought against him." The exception is a doubtful compliment to Milner.

At Magdalene itself there was as strong an Evangelical, who had almost as high an intellectual reputation, as Milner, and who did take the warmest personal interest in the undergraduates. This was Farish, a senior wrangler, the Professor of chemistry, and later the Jacksonian Professor of natural and experimental philosophy, who was a resident at Cambridge for more than sixty years, beginning in 1763. Like his friend Simeon, he took the charge of a parish there, St. Giles's, which he worked on the same lines that Simeon took at Trinity, and with nearly equal success. And, finally, may be mentioned Joseph Jowett, Fellow and tutor of Trinity Hall, and Regius Professor of civil law. Jowett was the intimate friend of Milner, who regularly spent two evenings alone with him every week; and under the dean's influence he worked the Evangelical cause so energetically in his college that Trinity Hall used to be called a fief of Queens'. It would be easy to find other instances, but enough have been given to illustrate how strong a force Evangelicalism was becoming at Cambridge before the end of the eighteenth century.

Prof. Farish.

Joseph Jowett.

In other parts of the country there were William Richardson at York, Thomas Robinson at Leicester, Thomas Dykes and John King at Hull, Samuel Knight at Halifax, Miles Atkinson at Leeds, Richard Conyers at Helmsley, James

Stillingfleet at Hotham, and others too numerous to mention, all advancing the Evangelical cause by their labours and their lives in the closing years of the century.

Hannah More.

More extensively useful in her way than any of these good men was a lady whose name requires more than a passing notice. Hannah More (1745-1833) rendered services to the Evangelical cause in various ways, in some of which she alone was in a position to do so. She formed a link not only between "the unworldly" and "the worldly," but also between the Evangelicals and some earnest people whose religion was not altogether of the Evangelical pattern. She was well known in society long before she became "serious," being a friend of David and Mrs. Garrick, of Dr. Johnson and other members of "The Club," of Mrs. Delany, Mrs. Carter, and Mrs. Chapone. She belonged to one of the Blue Stocking Clubs and wrote a poetical account of it, circulated in manuscript under the name of "Bas Bleu," which elicited from Dr. Johnson the extravagant eulogy that she was the most powerful versificatrix in the English language, and that "there was no name in poetry that might not be glad to own her 'Bas Bleu.'" A less magnificent but more practical homage was paid to her merits by Cadell the publisher, who in 1776 offered to give her the same amount for her poem *Sir Eldred of the Bower* that Goldsmith had received for *The Deserted Village*, thus putting her effusions on a level with one of the sweetest descriptive poems in the English language. Garrick admired a tragedy which she wrote; and he showed his admiration by having it performed at Covent Garden. Such an acquisition to the Evangelical cause might well be received with open arms.

But hers was not a sudden conversion. She came over by slow degrees, passing from point to point, and perhaps not to the last identifying herself with the Evangelical party. At any rate, there were other influences at work which did not emanate from it. The first step in her change was probably the death of Garrick in 1779, when she gave up play-going. But she did not break contact with "the world," for she retained the closest intimacy with Garrick's widow, and in 1781 made acquaintance with Horace Walpole, who

printed her poem *Bonner's Ghost* at the Strawberry Hill Press, and kept up a correspondence with her for many years. She made friends with Dr. Horne and Dr. Kennicott at Oxford, and with Dr. Beilby Porteus, the Bishop of London, who would all influence her in a religious, though, at any rate the two former, not altogether in an Evangelical direction. But more than any of these John Newton influenced her, as he did so many others. In 1781 she read his *Cardiphonia* and was much impressed by it. A correspondence ensued, and Newton, as his wont was, dealt most tenderly and sympathetically with her. She was also much touched by his preaching, and took him for her spiritual adviser. He at once saw how invaluable her peculiar position would be to the cause he had at heart, and wrote to her truly enough: "You have a great advantage, madam: there is a circle by which what you write will be read, and which will not read anything of a religious kind that is not written by you." This was put to a crucial test by the publication of the first work she wrote after her change, *Thoughts on the Importance of the Manners of the Great to General Society*, 1788, which showed much moral courage. The book was not written without an intimate knowledge of those whom she addressed. She was courted and flattered by the very people whose inner life she essayed to reprove. It was published anonymously, not from fear, but because "she hoped it might be attributed to a better person, and so might produce a greater effect." It is gratifying to find that when the authorship became known, the effect was not spoiled nor her popularity diminished. The work sold well. Seven large editions were sold in a few months, the second in little more than a week, and the third in four hours. Its influence was directly to be traced in the abandonment of many of the customs which were attacked. There was less card-playing, and therefore much less gambling. Sunday was more strictly observed, and the tone of general society became markedly serious. In 1790 appeared *An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World*, by way of sequel. This was bought and read with the same avidity as the preceding work. In 1799 Hannah More carried on her campaign against

Influence of her works.

the follies of the time by publishing *Strictures on Female Education.*

The books hitherto noticed were addressed to the world of fashion and society. *Village Politics* has already been dealt with. It appeared in 1792, and was followed by a series of tracts published regularly up to 1798 under the title of *Cheap Repository Tracts.* For writing these she was personally as well qualified as she had been for writing for the world of the educated and well-to-do. Like most of the Evangelicals, she was a worker, and a worker among the poor. Two millions of these tracts, which were published at the rate of three each month, were sold in the first year. She and her sister Patty, all through an indefatigable and sympathetic comrade, had settled at Cowslip Green, a cottage near Wrington, Somerset, where they were visited from time to time by many friends, and especially by John Newton. She was so affected by the spiritual destitution of Cheddar and the neighbourhood—a destitution amounting almost to paganism—that she resolved to establish schools for the education of the poor children, and religious instruction for the adults, a thing unknown at that time, when for the children of the poor there was practically no provision. The clergy were either non-resident or underpaid. The curate of Cheddar, who had entire charge of the parish, received £25 per annum. It was while William Wilberforce was staying with them at Barley Wood that he roused the sisters to a practical interest in their poorer neighbours. "Something must be done for Cheddar." It was high time. The restraining influence of religion being removed or torpid through disuse, the natural forces of unregenerate man broke out. Hereditary robbery was the tradition among the miners of Charterhouse on Mendip, and brought with it its inevitable terrorism.

Cheap Tracts.

Work at Cheddar.

Wilberforce and Thornton found the money, and work began in Cheddar in 1789 with the formation of a School of Industry and a Sunday School. In all, ten parishes, covering an area of some ten or twelve miles, in none of which was there a resident curate, were undertaken. Friends of the sisters came down from time to time to help, and the best obtainable paid workers were selected

Schools of Industry.

as resident teachers. The secular as well as the spiritual prosperity of all the villagers was cared for. A scheme for teaching the women to spin worsted for their own knitting was planned and carried out. A thorough visitation of Cheddar revealed an appalling state of affairs. Every house was found to be a scene of ignorance and vice. Only one Bible was to be discovered in all Cheddar, and that was used to prop up a flower-pot. There had been no resident clergyman for over forty years. Service was held once a Sunday by a minister who rode over from Wells, and eight people at a morning service and twenty at an afternoon one was regarded as a good attendance. There were terrible difficulties to be overcome. Hannah More says: "The principal adversary is a farmer of £1000 a year, who says the lower classes are fated to be wicked and ignorant, and that as wise as I am, I cannot alter what is decreed." Many parents refused to send their children unless they were paid for it, and some refused because they feared that at the end of seven years Hannah More might acquire power over them and sell them as slaves beyond the seas. Between three and four hundred were thus brought under instruction, at the cost of much time and labour, and travelling about. Sometimes it meant a thirty miles' journey, which, as she says, "is a little too much these short days." But it had indirect as well as direct influence for good. The clergy in the neighbourhood were led to compare their own slackness with the strenuous labours of the sisters to attach their people to the State as well as to the Church, to care alike for the body and the soul.

Opposition.

The following year they ventured a step further, and began work among the adults. A sermon of an awakening kind was read after Sunday evening school, and the parents and grown-up children were invited to attend: "many were awakened, and swearers and Sabbath-breakers reclaimed." Bibles were distributed and the villagers taught to read them. Clubs for women were founded, with a subscription of three halfpence a week. And so for the most part the opposition slowly died down, and the work prospered so that by the end of the century they had made that part of the diocese of Bath and Wells much better than they found it. There was one serious dispute, however, at the close of the

Results.

century. Upon the importunate invitation of the curate of Blagdon, Bere by name, Hannah More established a school in that parish, and for a time all went well. Then Bere began to attack her and her schoolmaster Young. He accused her of intrusion, and of being connected with conventicles, whereas she had never even been inside of one. The schoolmaster had allowed two or three of the villagers to attempt extemporary prayer, with which she was highly displeased, though out of consideration did not dismiss him. "That vulgar people," she said, "will be vulgar in their religion, and that illiterate people will talk ignorantly, who will deny?" The curate, who was also a magistrate, was bent on ruining the schoolmaster, and overshot the mark by stigmatising the More schools generally as seminaries of fanaticism, vice, and sedition. Hannah was said to be spreading French principles, and one of her schools was specifically charged with having prayed for the success of the French; the sole fact being that she had replied to Dupont, a French atheist, and given the profits of the work to the relief of the French emigrant clergy. Young was also accused of immorality, and the numbers of the school at once dropped from two hundred to thirty-five. Hannah More laid the whole matter before the bishop of the diocese, Richard Beadon, who decided in her favour. But the school, after a brief trial in the face of the opposition, was closed in 1800. Further inquiry was made, the curate's charges fully disproved, he was dismissed, and the school was reopened in 1802.

The Blagdon dispute.

The Evangelical movement spread very rapidly during the closing years of the century. It is true that its exponents occupied comparatively few of the prominent positions in the Church. They were to be found chiefly in proprietary chapels, fashionable watering-places, and in exceptional parishes here and there throughout the country. But by the close of the century they were more aggressive, more active than any other party in the Church, and this in spite of the many drawbacks to the teaching they gave and the ideal of life they presented. They were singularly lacking in learning. No volume of Evangelical theology has taken a permanent place in our literature. It is hardly exaggeration to

General Evangelical traits.

Lack of learning.

say that no theological nor scholarly work was produced by them at all. Sermons there were in abundance, but they are unknown and unread to-day. Theologians have to be sought outside their ranks. Then, again, they were not strong churchmen. In fact, Evangelicalism tended to increase dissent. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the proportion of dissenters to churchmen was one to twenty-four, at the beginning of the nineteenth one to four, and the enormous difference was largely due to the revival. The Evangelicals only brought into prominence one side of the Church's teaching, and did not attach much value to the Church's methods. Their sermons alone show that the Church's year was practically ignored. There are exceptions, but they are few, and even in them the references to the successive stages in the order of the seasons is slight. The same is true of their devotional works. They differed but very little from those produced by dissenters. The only marked exception is in the writings of John Wesley. Nor again did they do anything for Church architecture. They did not, like the Puritans of an earlier generation, injure the fabrics, but they left them alone, content so long as they had a pulpit to preach in and space to hold the congregations which came to hear them. They do not seem to have understood what the Church meant upon its corporate side, which can hardly be wondered at in an age when so little was done to emphasise and bring out that aspect. They concentrated attention upon the salvation of the individual soul, and neglected the further teaching of the grafting into the body of Christ's Church.

Lack of churchmanship.

Church's year.

The Church.

With curious inconsistency they denounced almost all forms of amusement such as theatres, dancing, especially enjoyable by the young, as worldly, while the pleasures of the table were retained and even increased. Fasting was an unknown virtue, while long and elaborate feeding was not judged unworthy of the disciples of the Master, though in this they but followed the spirit of the time. Madame D'Arblay notes in her *Diary* the growth of the number of meals a day, and of the time consumed in eating them. Life to the Evangelical was a rather gloomy thing even at its best. "Their feasts are not of an exhilarating

Amusements.

Feasts.

character," is the description of the Clapham Sect by one who knew it well from the inside. Death always loomed largely in their imagination, and this was fostered by the prominence given in their teaching to death-beds, as has already been pointed out in an earlier chapter. Their books are full of it, and their sermons abound with illustrations drawn from it. And yet, with all these drawbacks, they seasoned the life of the time with salt, and they illumined a dark age with gleams of heavenly light. They were used, though not very wise, not very strong intellectually, as the instruments of Him Whom they had learned to love, and Whom they taught many thousands to love also.

Death.

Summary.

AUTHORITIES.—To the authorities cited in Chapters XII. and XIII. should be added William Canton's *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 2 vols. 1904, which contains a good deal of information concerning Granville Sharp, the Thorntons, and the other members of the Clapham Sect. *Memoirs of Charles Simeon*, by William Carus, 1847, and *Charles Simeon*, by Bishop H. C. G. Moule, supplement and enlarge the chapter in Bishop J. C. Ryle's *Christian Leaders*. Bishop Moule is wrong in describing *The Whole Duty of Man* as "William Law's famous book." William Law had nothing to do with it. Isaac Milner's *Life of Joseph Milner*, 1814, and the articles in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* will suffice for the Milners. The work at Cheddar and the Blagdon dispute will be found in Hannah More's *Letters*, the latter particularly in her letter to Bishop Beadon. The letters are given in *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More*, by William Roberts, 4 vols. 1834. For William Wilberforce, see *Life* by his sons.

CHAPTER XVI

THE CLOSING YEARS OF THE CENTURY

We now pass to those churchmen who more adequately carried out the Church's system than did the Evangelicals, and who were theologians, which the Evangelicals were not. And on every account the name of Beilby Porteus demands the first place in this connexion. First, it prevents the transition from the notice of the Evangelicals from being too abrupt, for, as has been already seen, Bishop Porteus was the first prelate who showed any sympathy with the Evangelical party. Indeed, he was so sympathetic that he has sometimes been spoken of as their leader. This seems to be going too far, but he had undoubtedly many points of contact with them. Further, he was distinctly the most prominent bishop of the day, and entered more into public life, was more generally known, and perhaps was more influential than any other. He has already been kept too long waiting, for he came into note at an earlier period, but it was not till the latter part of the century that his fame and influence reached their zenith. Beilby Porteus (1731-1808) was born at York and lived all his life in England. But both his parents were natives of Virginia, and it may be that his hereditary connexion with another land gave him a wider outlook than was usual in the Church of the eighteenth century. He was educated first at York and then at Ripon, whence he proceeded to Christ's College, Cambridge, where, after a brilliant academical career, he was elected Fellow in 1752. He remained at Cambridge till 1762, when he removed to Lambeth as domestic chaplain to Archbishop

Bishop Beilby Porteus.

Secker. In 1765 the archbishop gave him the two small livings of Rucking and Wittersham, which he soon resigned for the rectory of Hunton, all in the county of Kent. In 1767 he became Rector of Lambeth; in 1769 a Royal chaplain, and Master of the Hospital of St. Cross, Winchester; in 1776 Bishop of Chester; and in 1787 Bishop of London. In all his spheres he was an exceedingly active worker and left his mark behind him.

He was a great admirer of Archbishop Secker, and in 1770 published *A Review of his Grace's Life and Character*, in which he indignantly and justly vindicates the archbishop's memory from some most unwarranted aspersions. The two men were not unlike either in opinions or character, though, possibly from the reason suggested above, Porteus took a broader view, did not think the English Church as it was to be so perfect a piece of machinery as Secker—agreeing in this with Warburton, Hurd, and other typical eighteenth-century bishops—appeared to think it. In fact, as a parish priest and still more as a bishop Porteus was essentially a reformer. His Act sermon for his D.D. degree in 1767 was a plea for reform in the religious instruction of youth, and so worked upon John Norris, into whose hands it fell, that he was thereby moved to found the Norrisian professorship of divinity. Though he could not join in the Feathers' Tavern Petition of 1772, no doubt not wishing to identify himself with the opinions of Blackburne, he joined in the abortive petition to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1778, for some reform of the Liturgy and Articles. As Rector of Lambeth he strove, not ineffectually, to bring about a reform as regards observance of Good Friday and other Fasts and Festivals of the Church; and the eleven years of his incumbency of the see of Chester were marked by numerous energetic attempts, some successful, some not, to promote reform in various directions. He favoured the activity of the Evangelical school, then in its infancy, as no other bishop did. He felt for the poverty of many of the clergy in his diocese, and instituted a fund for their relief. He warmly encouraged the establishment of Church Sunday Schools. He carried successfully through the House of Lords in 1777

Bishop of Chester.

the Bill of Bishop Lowth, who was incapacitated through ill-health, against the frequent abuse of incumbents giving bonds of resignation. He took great interest in the welfare of negro slaves, and strove to enlist the Society for Propagating the Gospel in their favour.

When, therefore, he became Bishop of London in 1787, he threw himself into, and indeed took the lead in, that revived spirit of activity which marked the time of his episcopate; and as he survived till 1808, he lived long enough to see and rejoice in some of the fruits of that spirit. It would be wearisome to recount all the schemes for good to which he not only lent the weight of his name but gave active personal aid. One of his first acts was to give an impetus to the newly-formed Society for enforcing the King's proclamation against immorality and profaneness. He was by far the most energetic of all the dignitaries who helped Wilberforce in and out of Parliament in the Anti-Slave trade crusade. He backed up Hannah More both in her practical and literary work, praising the latter, it must be owned, in wildly extravagant terms. Under his auspices was formed a Society for the Conversion and Religious Instruction of Negroes in the West Indies, and he succeeded in transferring to this Society the bequest of Robert Boyle for missionary work in America when, after the Declaration of Independence, it could no longer be applied to its original use. He revived the long-neglected observance of the season of Lent, preaching for four successive years a course of Lenten lectures at St. James's, Piccadilly, which created an extraordinary sensation.

Bishop of London.

He insisted strongly upon the religious observance of the Lord's Day, carrying his war against its desecration even into the very highest quarters, where, curiously enough, he was more successful with the irreligious Prince of Wales than with the religious King; for the Prince at once transferred his Sunday Club to a working day when the bishop represented to him how evil the example was; whereas he only succeeded in making George III. exceedingly angry when he remonstrated with him on the subject of the band playing on the terrace of Windsor Castle on Sunday afternoons. He set his face strongly against the importation of French principles, provid-

ing to the best of his ability, and encouraging his friend Hannah More to provide, antidotes against them. As at Chester, so when he went to Fulham he was a warm and active supporter of the new and rapidly spreading scheme of Sunday Schools, and did not in the least care about being dubbed a "Methodist" for his pains; for he was a man of independent spirit, with strong convictions and the courage of them. In fact, it may be doubted whether there was a more practically useful life during the whole of the century. It is one illustration of the lax views which prevailed in the eighteenth century about pluralities, that even this conscientious and reforming prelate thought it no harm to hold the rich living of Hunton in Kent in conjunction with the bishopric of Chester.

Bishop Shute Barrington.

Next to Bishop Porteus, Shute Barrington (1734-1826) was the prelate in the eighteenth century who approached nearest to Evangelicalism, though, like Porteus, he did not wholly identify himself with it. He was rather one of those men who like to recognise good work wherever it can be found, and as it was nowhere found in such abundance as among the Evangelicals, he so far, but only so far, was one with them. He was a friend of William Wilberforce and of Hannah More, but, as has already been intimated, both those good people had many attached friends with whom they could co-operate easily, outside the Evangelical circle. Bishop Barrington was also intimate with Charles Daubeny, one of the chiefs of the High Church party, and the patron of William Paley, the liberal churchman to whom he gave one of the most valuable livings in his diocese. He was a favourable specimen of the aristocratic type of prelate common in the latter half of the century, and he showed his high-breeding not by pride and exclusiveness, but by a delicate, dignified courtesy, and by a most generous and judicious use of the ample resources at his command as Bishop of Durham. Neither Porteus nor Barrington, however, approached the intellectual standard of another prelate who adorned the Bench in the later years of the century.

Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) was the strongest writer in defence of the Catholic faith since the days of Butler, Waterland, and Law. It is to be noted that he does not appear

to have distinguished himself at either of the universities, though he was connected with both, and his earlier writings seem to indicate that his special strength lay in science rather than in theology. It is probably to Bishop Lowth that we owe this champion of the faith, for though Horsley took holy orders, and held, first, the living of Newington in Surrey and then of Albury, his mind was chiefly given to scientific pursuits until Lowth, on his appointment to the see of London in 1777, made him his domestic chaplain and prebendary of St. Paul's, and gave him various preferments—Vicar of Thorley in 1780, Archdeacon of St. Albans in 1782, and when he resigned Thorley, Vicar of South Weald, Essex. It was as Archdeacon of St. Albans that Horsley first showed how great a divine he was. His charges in that capacity are masterpieces in defence of the Holy Trinity. His first charge, delivered in 1783, contains a crushing criticism of Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*, which had been published the year before. The controversy between them went on until 1790, when Priestley left the country. The titles of Horsley's writings on the Trinity give a very inadequate idea of their importance. "*Tracts*," "*Remarks*," "*Letters*" lead us to expect slight productions, whereas in point of fact Horsley not only demolished his adversary but carried on the work which Waterland had begun sixty years earlier. He showed to demonstration the impossibility of taking any middle ground between Trinitarianism—in other words, the Catholic faith—and Unitarianism pure and simple. His works are models of English composition, pure and stately in style, irrefragable in argument, sarcastic, but never scurrilous. His sermons and his speeches in the House of Lords after he became a bishop, which have been published separately, are equally conspicuous for their powerful reasoning and admirable English. They a little remind us of Bishop Horne's, showing the same dignity and restrained force; but though Horne is very good, Horsley is better. And yet Horsley is forgotten.

Samuel Horsley.

As Bishop successively of St. David's 1788, Rochester 1793, and St. Asaph 1802, Horsley showed himself an active and conscientious worker, especially in his two Welsh sees, where bishops were not wont to work diligently. Altogether

he seems to have been the greatest figure in the Church since the death of Bishop Butler, and he was generally so regarded. He is said to have had the defects of his qualities, and to have been somewhat irritable and dictatorial; but lesser men might be content to be dictated to by such a giant. His reputation was immense. Bishop Jebb called him "our ablest modern prelate"; S. T. Coleridge "the one red leaf, the last of its clan, with relation to the learned teachers of our Church"; Isaac Milner, "the first episcopal authority, if learning, wisdom, and knowledge of the Scriptures be any foundation for authority"; John Milner, the Roman Catholic, "the light and glory of the Established Church." The reputation was well deserved, though it is remarkable, considering the comparatively little that he wrote, that it should have been gained. Bishop Horsley, as we should expect, had a much clearer idea of what true churchmanship was than was usual in days when Erastianism and Latitudinarianism on the one hand, and Methodism on the other hand, were pushing the old idea of the Church out of sight.

His conception of churchmanship is expressed in his own stately manner, in his charge to the diocese of St. David's in 1790: "To be a *High churchman*," he says, "in the only sense which the word can be allowed to bear as applicable to any in the present day,—God forbid that this should ever cease to be my public pretension, my pride, my glory! . . . In the language of our modern sectaries, every one is a High churchman who is not unwilling to recognise so much as the spiritual authority of the priesthood; every one who, denying what we ourselves disclaim, anything of a divine right to temporalities, acknowledges, however, in the sacred character, something more divine than may belong to the more hired servants of the State or of the laity; and regards the services which we are thought to perform for our pay, as something more than a part to be gravely played in the drama of human politics. My reverend brethren, we must be content to be High churchmen, according to this usage of the word, or we cannot be churchmen at all; for he who thinks of God's ministers as the mere servants of the State is out of the Church—severed from it by a kind of self-excommunication."

High Church.

He further distinguishes between a High churchman in the sense of "a bigot to the secular rights of the priesthood," which he declares he is not, and a High churchman in the sense of "an upholder of the spiritual authority of the priesthood," which he owns that he is; and he adds, "we are more than mere hired servants of the State or laity." On the other hand, he thoroughly agreed with the Evangelicals in insisting upon the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, and in not being content with the mere preaching of virtue and morality. He dreaded the teaching prevalent in some quarters that practical religion and morality are one and the same thing, and that moral duties constitute the whole, or by far the better part, of practical Christianity. This he regarded as reducing practical Christianity to heathen virtue. Sermons that inculcated only moral duties were not sermons, but mere moral essays divested of the genuine spirit and savour of the ministry of the Word, and the heathens could produce better ones. Men were not ordained to spread the strict but impracticable and sullen morality of the stoic, but to preach the word of reconciliation. But he saw that the day of that kind of preaching was over, or nearly so. The people had shown themselves capable of receiving deeper instruction than some of their teachers had imagined, and were not, therefore, any longer to be deprived of knowledge concerning the Trinity, the Incarnation, Expiation, and Communion with the Spirit. These great doctrines properly expounded would be a deeper basis for true morality than any merely ethical teaching propounded by the "apes of Epictetus."

Moral sermons.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, Cambridge was far more productive than Oxford of men who influenced religious thought and life. Oxford had never recovered from that sulky acquiescence with which, against its conscience, it had accepted the Hanoverian dynasty, and from the accession of George I. to the close of the century it was stagnant to the last degree except in regard to Jacobite politics. Cambridge was, as we have seen, an important centre of Evangelicalism, and it also produced writers and thinkers of reputation belonging to other and different schools. Three men who were nearly contemporaries, and who all held official positions in the university, deserve special notice.

By far the most important of these is William Paley (1743-1805), whose works still live, though later discoveries have rendered some of their positions obsolete. Paley was an incarnation of the eighteenth century both in his strong and in his weak points. On the one hand, his intellect was manly and robust, his style vigorous and clear as crystal, and his matter brimful of plain common-sense. On the other hand, he was singularly wanting in sentiment and unction. There was not a spark of poetry in his composition, and though on some points he was liberal to the verge of heterodoxy, his thoughts were bounded within a somewhat limited horizon. But within his limits he did valuable service to theology by his writings, which are too numerous to be specified in detail.

William Paley.

His *Horae Paulinae*, published in 1790, is a most ingenious and convincing book, written on a plan which seems to be original; it was not at first so successful as it deserved to be, nor as others of his writings were, but as time went on it was more and more appreciated, and a new edition appeared so late as 1877. It was from this book probably that Professor J. J. Blunt took the idea of his interesting work, *Undesigned Coincidences*. Much more popular at first than the *Horae Paulinae* was Paley's *View of the Evidences of Christianity*, published in 1794, which came out seasonably just when the writings of Hume, whose argument against miracles the treatise was specially designed to meet, and Gibbon were affecting the higher classes, and those of Thomas Paine and others of a like stamp the lower. The *Natural Theology* did not appear till 1802, but it must be regarded as belonging to the eighteenth century, because it was intended not as a sequel but as an introduction to the *Evidences*, as Paley himself tells us in his Dedication to his patron and diocesan, Bishop Shute Barrington. "The following Discussion alone was wanted to make up my works into a system; in which works, such as they are, the public have before them the evidences of Natural Religion, the evidences of Revealed Religion, and an account of the duties that result from both. It is of small importance that they have been written in an order the very reverse of that in which they ought to be read."

Paley was certainly the most prominent Church writer in

the later part of the eighteenth century, and it has been put down to the discredit of the dispensers of Church patronage that he was not made a bishop. But it is difficult to imagine that he would have cared to submit to the trammels by which, though the time was far more lax than the present, the episcopal office was burdened. All his habits were unconventionally free and easy, and it is probable that he was much more comfortable as he was than he would have been as a bishop, particularly as his merits were not unrewarded so far as emolument went. Though not a bishop himself, he won the favour of several. His friend, Bishop Law of Carlisle, gave him successively four livings, Musgrave, Dalston, Appleby, and Salkeld, a prebend at Carlisle, and an archdeaconry; Bishop Yorke of Ely offered him the mastership of Jesus College, Cambridge; Bishop Vernon, Law's successor at Carlisle, gave him the living of Stanmore, which he accepted instead of Dalston, among other reasons for the practical and characteristic one that "his stock of sermons was recurring too rapidly." From Bishop Porteus he received the prebend of St. Pancras in St. Paul's Cathedral, which did not involve residence and enabled him still to live in the North; from Pretyman of Lincoln the sub-deanery of Lincoln, to which a residentiary canonry was attached; and finally Bishop Barrington of Durham gave him the valuable living of Bishop Wearmouth, which he held, together with the sub-deanery of Lincoln, until his death. So by whomsoever else he was neglected, he was not neglected by the bishops, and was not left without his share of the loaves and fishes of the Church. To do him justice, he did not complain either of neglect or poverty. His friends and later admirers have done that for him.

Richard Watson (1737-1816) held very similar theological views to those of William Paley, and defended the Christian faith against unbelievers as successfully in his way as Paley did in his. But Watson's was a very broad general belief indeed, not at all like that of the Evangelicals on the one hand, nor of men of the Horsley, Horne, and Jones type on the other. He has not improved his reputation by the singularly frank expression of his own infirmities which he has given us in that curious piece of

Richard Watson.

autobiography entitled *Anecdotes of my own Life*. But there is reason to believe that, like some other autobiographers, he has not done himself justice. However, be this as it may, the Church should not forget the services Bishop Watson rendered to her by at least two works which justly became classical. One was his *Apology for Christianity* published in 1776, addressed to Edward Gibbon in answer to the attack on Christianity made in the fifteenth chapter of the *Decline and Fall*. Gibbon himself owned that Watson was "the most candid of adversaries," and his candour made his book all the more effective. Its popular style and manner caused it to be widely circulated, and it has often been reprinted. His other work, *An Apology for the Bible*, was at least as successful; it was published in 1796 as an answer to the strictures of Thomas Paine, and has also been frequently reprinted. George III.'s well-known comment, "Apology for the Bible! Apology for the Bible! I did not know that the Bible required an apology," which has to a certain extent been echoed by a more competent authority on such a subject, the late Archdeacon Perry, may render it necessary to add that Bishop Watson used the word "apology" not in its popular but in its proper sense, as synonymous with defence.

In judging of Bishop Watson, as in the case of others in the same century, it must be remembered that the standard of public opinion of those days is not that of our own time. But even then it must be admitted that no such flagrant case of the abuse of patronage as his can be found to parallel it. After graduating as second wrangler, he was appointed Professor of chemistry at Cambridge at a time when he says quite candidly that he "knew nothing at all of chemistry, had never read a syllable on the subject, nor seen a single experiment in it." But he was tired of mathematics and natural philosophy, and the *vehementissima gloriae cupido*, as he phrases it, stimulated him to try his strength in a new pursuit and animated him to extraordinary exertions. He sent to Paris for a demonstrator, buried himself in his new study, and in fourteen months was lecturing to full audiences. This was in 1764, and assuredly the chemical knowledge of that age could easily be acquired by one already proficient enough to take so high a mathematical degree and to examine for the

Tripos, and let it further be added to his credit that there was no stipend attached to the post. He was allowed the use of a room for lectures. His researches into various phenomena respecting the solutions of salts won for him his election as a Fellow of the Royal Society. When the Regius professorship of divinity was vacant in 1771, he adroitly obtained the King's mandate for a divinity degree; he was elected to the vacant chair, and characteristically applied himself at once to the study of divinity. The principle of election at Cambridge in those days appears to have been to appoint men who were likely to study rather than those who had already shown their proficiency by authorship. Watson's mode of studying divinity was all his own. "I reduced the study of divinity into as narrow a compass as I could, for I determined to study nothing but the Bible, being much unconcerned about the opinions of councils, fathers, churches, and bishops, and other men as little inspired as myself."

Professorships.

He fretted for want of higher preferment, and never lost an opportunity of letting his feelings be known. He recalled D'Alembert's dictum that "the highest offices in Church and State resemble a pyramid whose top is accessible to only two sorts of animals, eagles and reptiles." Disdaining the methods of the reptile, he sulked because his pinions, he says, were not strong enough to pounce upon the top. At length, in 1782, he was appointed Bishop of Llandaff, still retaining his professorship, but he soon became non-resident there as well as at Cambridge. He acquired an estate in Westmoreland, and practically lived there for the remainder of his life, planting trees, building farm-houses, reclaiming wastes, blasting rocks (he was very interested in explosives), recovering his health, preserving his independence, setting an example of spirited industry to the county, and honourably providing for his family. These occupations were diversified by letters to powerful ministers upon questions of preferment, and visits to the House of Lords. His duties as professor were discharged by deputy, and as to his diocese he seems only very occasionally to have remembered that he had one. There was no episcopal residence, and he took no pains to buy or build

Llandaff.

Aims.

one, and contented himself with visits few and far between. His books, his letters, his speeches, his scientific researches were all in the right direction, but nothing can excuse his signal and wilful failure as a bishop of the Church.

John Hey.

Of the third and eldest of this trio less need be said. John Hey (1734-1815) was the first holder of the Norrisian professorship of divinity, which, as we have seen, John Norris, worked upon by a sermon of Bishop Porteus, founded in 1780. His title to fame is his professorial lectures. They contain an enormous amount of information on almost all the vast subjects connected with controversial divinity, and were at one time regarded as a standard work. Hey was even more inclined to liberalism in theology than either Watson or Paley. But they all belong to the same school of thought, as also did the two Laws, Edward, Bishop of Carlisle, the patron of Paley, and John, Paley's friend and his predecessor in the archdeaconry, who vacated it for the bishopric of Clonfert.

Liberal churchmanship.

In fact, in the later part of the century—certainly until the French Revolution created an alarm of all liberalism, theological as well as political — this was the most intellectual party then in the Church. Its members almost all emanated from Cambridge, and individually they made a considerable impression; but they never formed a compact body. They had no definite policy, and not very definite opinions of a positive sort. The Evangelicals and High churchmen had both, and people who desired to be guided definitely in their religious faith and practice naturally turned to one or the other of them for guidance, and not to the liberals. It was not, however, till the nineteenth century had dawned that the little party of High churchmen, of whom in the later years of the eighteenth Jones of Nayland was the leading member, began to be known as a spiritual and practical force; and the Evangelicals had hardly begun to exercise their full influence until the same period. So up to the close of the eighteenth century there was at best a promise of better things to come rather than any fulfilment of that promise. This is painfully illustrated in a very interesting document published late in 1799, which reached a second edition in 1800. It is entitled *A Report*

from the Clergy of a District in the Diocese of Lincoln for the Purpose of considering the State of Religion in the several Parishes of the said District, and the advertisement to it says, "It is to be feared that this interesting statement of facts existing in the district to which the Report relates will be found, upon examination, to be applicable to a great part of the kingdom." If this be true, the outlook was certainly not encouraging. The statistics which are given about Church services, religious education, and the like, indicate a low state of affairs. The clergy who issued it take a full share of the blame upon themselves, and one of the chief objects of the convention seems to have been to stimulate one another to further exertions. They pay a warm tribute to the earnestness and activity of the bishop of the diocese, Dr. Pretyman, and their testimony is fully borne out by other evidences which show that the bishop, who has obtained a somewhat evil reputation for nepotism, the prevailing episcopal fault of the day, was as conspicuous for his energy in his spiritual work.

Lincoln *Report.*

Their *Report* illustrates the relations which then subsisted between the Church and Methodism. "Methodists," it says, "might be ranked under three divisions. Some professed to be members of the Church of England, and regularly attended divine service at church and partook of the Holy Sacrament, but had places set apart for additional exercises of devotion, at such hours as did not interfere with the Church Service." These were "frequently found useful and zealous auxiliaries in reforming and reclaiming many habitual sinners, both by their admonitions and examples." The memorialists greatly regret that such persons should register themselves as Protestant dissenters. Others rarely, if ever, attended the Church Services, took no note of the hours at which they were held, and had lately begun to administer the Holy Sacrament at their meetings. Many of them were persons of much piety; but they were ever ready to set up rivalries and opposition to the clergy of the Church, and to foment divisions between them and their parishioners. Especially it was regretted that these should appear to countenance and encourage a third division of so-called Methodists, commonly ignorant men, who held gross and extravagant

views, and "seemed to have no point of union except to calumniate the clergy and revile the Church, which they do with unrelenting violence." The memorial further states that the Methodists did not generally consider themselves dissenters; and that the real dissenters were in their part of the country few in number, and in general by no means hostile towards the Church or its clergy. The most valuable feature in the *Report* is the indication which it gives of the stirring of the dry bones, the result of which was seen in the early years of the nineteenth century. The *Report* probably emanated from clergy who were more or less Evangelicals, but it shows no party feeling and might have been cordially endorsed by others who belonged to different schools of thought.

While, however, the Church was weak on its ecclesiastical and spiritual sides, it was on its intellectual side undoubtedly strong. It kept more than abreast with the intellectual problems of the day. Learning, both theological and general, was more appreciated and received more encouragement than it does now; and though, of course, the clergy of to-day are more enlightened than those of the eighteenth century, it may seriously be doubted whether they are so relatively to the general standards of the time. Be this as it may, an unprejudiced person can hardly fail to admit that the advocates of Christianity all through the century more than held their own against its opponents. In its conflict with Deism, Atheism, Unitarianism, the Church not only refuted the errors of those who attacked it, but also produced in the process, what was even of greater value, constructive works of positive and permanent worth, such as the world will never willingly allow to perish, works which belong to literature as well as to theological science, and have become the treasured possession of Christians of all denominations. The *Serious Call*, the *Spirit of Prayer*, the *Spirit of Love*, the *Analogy*, the *Practical View*, the *Horae Paulinae*, John Wesley's *Journal*, the Wesley *Hymns*, to name no others, mark a century of profound scholarship, intellectual vigour, and growing moral sensitiveness, all springing from the consciousness of the reality of the presence of God, the truth of Revelation, and the necessity of spiritual and moral reformation. They were confined almost

necessarily to the culture of the individual Christian life; to redress the balance and give due weight to the spiritual and practical element, belonged to a later age. The last breath of the eighteenth century created the age of religious Societies, some of which were already doing good and noble work.

Brief notice has already been made of the work of the Clapham Sect in furthering the movement for the abolition of the Slave Trade. As the century neared its close, the fuller effects of the religious revivals on the one hand, and of the growth of toleration and the efforts after freedom symbolised by the French Revolution on the other, began to make themselves felt alike among the leaders of public opinion and the people generally. The horrors of the traffic in slaves excited increased detestation. The sense of responsibility toward subject and inferior races grew and intensified. The trade had already been made the subject of regulation intended to control and mitigate its worst features, but the enactments had been openly and flagrantly set at naught. Granville Sharp, John Wesley, and the Quakers both in England and America continued to protest by document and by practical action against the traffic which, affected adversely for a while during the War of Independence, had revived considerably after the peace of 1783. The question was brought before Parliament in that same year in a Bill for introducing some regulations into the trade. The Quakers, through Sir Cecil Wray, presented a petition for its abolition, but Lord North, while in sympathy with the agitators, declared that it would be next to impossible to induce the nations of Europe to give up the trade and renounce it for ever. Impossible, however, was a word unknown to Wilberforce and his friends in any such connexion, and in 1787 Wilberforce agreed to introduce the matter to the House, and Granville Sharp founded the famous Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade, of which the majority of the original twelve members were Quakers. They began by collecting evidence, and this went to prove that the method of deportation, to begin with, was so bad that out of every hundred negroes taken from Africa not more than fifty ever lived to become efficient labourers in the West. This was chiefly due to the disgraceful system of

The Slave Trade.

deportation known as the middle passage, during which the poor wretches were carried across the seas crowded between the decks. In 1788 a committee of the Privy Council was appointed to make thorough inquiry, and Pitt brought in a resolution pledging Parliament to deal with the matter next session. This was carried unanimously, and a little later, though not without strong opposition from Liverpool (one of the chief centres of the trade, and an almost consistent supporter of it and of slavery generally for many a long year yet to come), a Bill was carried regulating the numbers that might be deported in slave ships. In 1791 the influence of the French Revolution began to tell the other way. Many feared that to uphold a movement which was supported by the Jacobins in France would be interpreted as adhesion to Jacobin principles; and accordingly, when Wilberforce asked leave to bring in a Bill to prevent the further importation of slaves into our possessions in the West Indies, the leave was refused by a majority of two to one, in spite of the support given to him by Pitt, Fox, and Burke. Later, in 1792, the opposition had become organised as well as the agitation in favour of the slave. While, on the one hand, thousands in England denied themselves the use of sugar because it was cultivated by slave labour, on the other, many felt that the source of their wealth was in danger; while there were others who dreaded the general influence upon the life of the nation of popular public meetings. Wilberforce brought in a motion for immediate abolition, and was supported by Pitt in what is regarded as his finest speech. But an amendment by Dundas in favour of a gradual abolition was carried against the immediate abolitionists. Still, this was something to be thankful for, and 1796 was the year agreed upon for the total cessation. The House of Lords, however, demanded further evidence, and the question was again postponed. The same fate attended the resolutions of 1797, 1798, and 1799 both in the Commons and in the Lords. But the work was begun.

AUTHORITIES.—Bishop Horsley should be studied in his *Charges*, 1830, and his *Letters to Dr. Priestley*; Paley in his *Works*, and *Memoirs*, by G. W. Meadley. The *Anecdotes of the Life of Bishop Watson*, published by his son, 2 vols. 1818, are valuable both for their self-unveiling of the man and for their picture of the times.

CHAPTER XVII

GENERAL CHURCH LIFE

The history of great leaders of thought and action in any period and in any department can only convey a very inadequate idea of the history of the general mass. This is especially true of the eighteenth century, when in a greater degree perhaps than at any other time the leaders of men stood out more prominently than usual amongst their fellows. There were, that is to say, more great men in proportion to the mass than in preceding and subsequent periods. And in no department of life is this more true than in that of religion. In the preceding chapters our attention has naturally been drawn to great champions of the faith, prelates, writers, preachers, revivalists, and so forth. But meanwhile what were the immense majority about, men who were not great in any sense of the word? What was the general character of the Church life of the period before us?

From the nature of the case it is hardly possible to treat such a subject chronologically, and happily there is no need in this case to make the attempt. For the general character of Church life from the accession of George I. to the end of the century, or at any rate to the last decade of the century, remained in a singular degree unchanged. The tone of mind and habits of life of average churchmen, say, in 1720 and 1780 seem to have differed very little. So in this chapter it is possible to generalise without any sacrifice of truth. This applies as a natural consequence to things inanimate. The appearance and arrangements of a church would be much the same at the later as at the

Church arrangements.

earlier date. Few churches, parsonages, or school buildings date from this period. Many date from the reign of Queen Anne, and many more from the first quarter of the nineteenth century, but hardly any from the years covered by this volume. "Let well alone" was the motto of the time, without too critical an inquiry whether it was well.

It would not be fair to our ancestors to attribute this unchanging attitude of theirs to a want of interest in religion. On the contrary, it arose to a great extent from precisely the opposite cause. It was a reaction in two different ways from the events of the seventeenth century. These events had thoroughly disgusted them with Puritanism in every shape. They shrank from anything that might tend, however remotely, to restore the reign of the "saints." And, on the other hand, the events of the later part of the century had thoroughly alarmed them on the score of popery. They tried, therefore, to warily steer a middle course, and the best way of doing this was by going very quietly. "Enthusiasm" would be sure to drive them either on the rock Scylla or into the pool Charybdis, and either would equally shatter the good ship, the Church of England. There was all through the time a real and sincere attachment to the Church, but it was rather a blind and unreasoning one. It showed itself rather by obstructiveness than by progress. "Our happy Establishment" was right enough as it was. The presumption was that any change would be for the worse. The proverbial apathy of the age was at least as much the effect as the cause of this feeling; though here, as in so many cases, cause and effect mutually acted and reacted upon each other. It was a narrow way, in a different sense from the scriptural one, in which the Church moved, so far as it moved at all.

Revolt from Puritanism.

Revolt from popery.

The middle way.

It was a pity that it should have had such a repugnance to movement, that is, progress, because the Church had advantages then which it perhaps never had before nor has had since, and which certainly it has not at the present day. It was, we have seen, a time in which the ministers of religion were held in slight esteem, and in which the contempt felt was not against the Church system as such, but for the persons, manners, and characters of the ministers—a contempt

which could not have been created by a hard working, devoted body of clergy. This is borne out by the lugubrious tone in which bishops in their charges speak of the bad treatment of their clergy, and also by the virulent abuse which is heaped upon the clergy in the literature of the Freethinkers.

Prevalent pessimism.

But too much weight must not be attached to this kind of evidence. The bishops, especially about the middle of the century, take a gloomy view all round. It was the fashion then to mourn the evils of the times, just as it is the fashion now to exult over the wonderful improvement of the times. The language of the Freethinkers must obviously be discounted, because the clergy were essential parts of a system they wished to destroy. Moreover, the bishops were but slightly in touch with the people. They inhabited what was practically a different world. Their rare and formal visits to parishes for Confirmations were frequently the only ones they ever made. Their friends belonged to the upper classes of society, the superior clergy and learned men. Their public appearances in populous centres were not frequent. Public meetings and the business of committee rooms were almost unknown to them, and for the most part they cared little about schemes for social amelioration or for improving parochial and diocesan machinery.

But, however unpopular many of the clergy might be, the clerical profession itself was certainly not unpopular. Men did not shrink from taking orders as they do nowadays, and the Church itself, so far from being unpopular, was the only religious system with which the vast majority of the nation would have anything to do. It was a source partly of weakness and partly of strength that it thus touched the nation at more points than it does now. Its weakness, in that it arose from and led to its being far too much secularised; its strength, in that it enabled the Church to leaven the national life for good; and to a certain extent it succeeded in doing this. A low standard existed all round, and the clergy as a body rose a little, though only a very little, higher than the general level. The influence which they exercised from their contact with the laity, from many causes closer than it is now, was on the whole good, so far as it went, though it did not go very far. The causes which brought

The clergy.

the clergy into closer contact with the laity then can only be arrived at by remembering how very different the framework of society then was. In many towns the distinction between the trading and the professional classes was not so marked as it is now; and in the country a whole class has been swept away which was then perhaps the most important element in country life, that of the small squires; while the great county magnates lived in their country-seats much longer every year than at present. The clergy might as likely as not be connected by ties of relationship as well as of profession with tradesmen; they were of the same social position, and had on an average about the same income as the smaller gentry. On the other hand as domestic chaplains, and still more as tutors to their children, they were brought into intimate connexion with the nobility and county families; and the cadets of these families always looked upon the Church as an available profession, and one would always hold the family living. The professional duties of the clergy did not press very heavily upon them, and hence they united largely with all classes of society, not excluding the poor, to whom they were kind friends and neighbours, if not particularly elevating spiritual directors. Truth to tell, they were not very distinguishable from laity of the same social standing except on Sundays. A little less coarse, a little more strict in morals, a little better informed. That was all. They fished and shot and hunted with them, farmed with them, attended markets and fairs with them, dressed very much as the laity did, after the clerical bands and cassock had fallen into disuse by about the middle of the century.

Dr. Primrose at Wakefield in fiction and Dr. Taylor at Ashbourne in real life are good specimens of the genus. It was quite natural that Dr. Primrose in his poverty should go to the fair himself to sell his colt, and also have a friendly glass with the purchasers over the transaction at the inn; and Boswell's description of Dr. Taylor's way of living at Ashbourne is so characteristic of the well-to-do clergyman of the period that it is worth quoting. "On Tuesday, March 26, there came for us an equipage properly suited to a wealthy, well-beneficed clergyman: Dr. Taylor's large, roomy post-chaise, drawn by four stout, plump horses, and driven by

Dr. Taylor.

two steady, jolly postilions, which conveyed us to Ashbourne; where I found my friend's school-fellow living upon an establishment perfectly corresponding with his substantial, creditable equipage; his house, garden, pleasure-grounds, table, in short everything good and no scantiness appearing. Dr. Taylor had a good estate of his own, and good preferment in the Church, being a Prebendary of Westminster and Rector of Bosworth. He was a diligent justice of the peace and presided over the town of Ashbourne, to the inhabitants of which I was told he was very liberal; and as a proof of this it was mentioned to me, he had the preceding winter distributed two hundred pounds among such of them as needed his assistance. He had consequently a considerable political interest in the county of Derby, which he employed to support the Devonshire family; for though the school-fellow and friend of Johnson, he was a Whig. I could not perceive in his character much congeniality of any sort with that of Johnson, who, however, said to me, 'Sir, he has a strong understanding.' His size and figure and countenance and manner were that of a hearty English 'squire, with the parson superinduced; and I took particular notice of his upper-servant, Mr. Peters, a decent, grave man in purple clothes and a large white wig, like the butler or *major-domo* of a bishop."

Another very characteristic specimen of an eighteenth-century clergyman of a different type is Richard Graves (1715-1804), writer of the once well-known romance *The Spiritual Quixote*. He was a scholar and a gentleman, held a scholarship at Pembroke and a fellowship at All Souls, Oxford, and was the domestic chaplain at Tissington Hall, Derbyshire, the residence of Mr. Fitzherbert, who gave him the donative living of Tissington. There he made acquaintance with several distinguished men, but after three years he resigned his charge and made a tour in the north of England. He took a curacy, and in 1748 was presented by Sir William Skrine to the living of Claverton near Bath, which he held until his death in 1804, never being absent from his living for a month together for fifty-four years. But the credit of this unusual length of residence is a little discounted by the fact that, like so many

Richard Graves.

clergymen of his day, he became a pluralist and accepted cures on which, of course, he could not reside. His neighbourhood to Bath introduced him to that model country gentleman, Ralph Allen of Prior Park, who obtained for him in 1763 the adjoining living of Kilmersden, near Bath, and the office of chaplain to the Countess of Chatham. And in his old age, in 1793, he accepted the rectory of Croscombe, near Wells, to hold until the patron's nominee was ready to enter upon it. For thirty years he took pupils, whom he educated with his own children. Among his pupils were Ralph Allen's only son; Henry Skrine, son of his patron; Malthus, the political economist, who ministered to him in his last hours; and Prince Hoare, the artist. Graves was a voluminous writer both in prose and verse, publishing over twenty separate works. The only one which has lived is his novel—*The Spiritual Quixote*, which he appropriately termed a "Comic Romance"; it is certainly comic, being written in a racy, lively style; and it may be called a romance in that it gives a most erroneous account of the motives and character of poor George Whitefield, who had been a servitor at Pembroke when Graves was a scholar. Those who know anything of Oxford will readily understand how the scholar and fellow would naturally look down upon the poor servitor, and could hardly understand the power which he became. Another Pembroke contemporary, who made no great figure at college, Samuel Johnson, speaks hardly less contemptuously of George Whitefield, but he does not represent him as Graves does, as a sleek hypocrite who made a good thing out of his preaching. Graves's horror of "enthusiasm" was quite in the eighteenth-century vein, and his greatest enemies could not accuse him of being an enthusiast himself. His works, with the exception of a volume of sermons, were not of a theological kind, but they are thoroughly characteristic of the mind of an eighteenth-century clergyman. Among other notable men with whom he formed a friendship was Shenstone, the pastoral poet, who frequently visited him at Claverton.

A clergyman of a different type was Thomas Stackhouse (1677-1752), like Richard Graves an author of repute, though his career was different. For the first thirty years of his ministerial life he was in great poverty, being only an

assistant curate until he reached the ripe age of fifty-six. Of his two most famous works, *The Miseries and Great Hardships of the Inferior Clergy in and about London* appeared in 1722. In this he could speak from experience, having been curate first of Shepperton, near Chertsey, and then of Finchley; and most curious and in many cases painful are the details which he gives. He declares that the curates' "salaries were often less than the sexton's, and not so punctually paid; that the rectors made jests upon their poverty; that the common fee for a sermon was a shilling and a dinner, for reading prayers twopence and a cup of coffee." His *magnum opus*, a *History of the Bible*, came out in numbers, and was then published in two volumes folio in 1737. Later investigations have, of course, rendered it obsolete, and it is now chiefly known through the delightful notice of it in the *Essays of Elia*. But it was a work of great labour, employed, like all Stackhouse's writings, upon the subject which ought above all others to occupy a clergyman's thoughts. It was one of the faults of the eighteenth century that the clergy devoted both their lives and writings to matters which did not belong to them as clergymen, and it must be confessed that the treatment of Stackhouse would not encourage them to be more professional. However, the grievance was redressed by the good bishop, Dr. Gibson, who in 1733 gave him the living of Benham Valence, which at any rate relieved him of the burden of poverty, as he himself gratefully owned. *His Life of Our Lord and Saviour, with the Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists*, published in 1754, was frequently to be found in country libraries even up to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, sumptuously bound and profusely illustrated.

Thomas Stackhouse.

There were few families in the eighteenth century which rendered greater service to the Church than that of Sharp. The highest dignitary among them, John Sharp, Archbishop of York, does not come within our purview, for he died in 1714. His very great influence over Queen Anne, and his high reputation generally, contributed largely to the comparatively satisfactory state of the Church in the early years of the century. His sons and his grandsons never attained to his eminence, but they were

Archbishop John Sharp.

worthy scions of a good stock. To Thomas Sharp (1693-1758) we owe the excellent biography of the good archbishop, which, however, was not published till 1825. He was Archdeacon of Northumberland and a prebendary of Durham, and he is as excellent a specimen of the good parish priest as the son of John Sharp would be expected to be, and was for twenty years trustee of Lord Crewe's charity at Bamborough, which is worth noting for a reason which will appear later. "My father," writes Granville Sharp in a letter to a friend in 1793, "was rector of a certain parish, Rothbury, in the county of Northumberland, and retained at his own expense five, if not more, different schools in the villages, at convenient distances, for the instruction of poor children whose parents could not afford to send them to school. The children in all these schools were taught writing and arithmetic as well as reading, so that, in a long course of years, there were very few to be found in the parish who could not write, if not retain also some knowledge of figures; and no people could be more remarkable for industrious exertion in the most humble labour, and at the same time for modesty and good behaviour, than the parishioners of Rothbury in general. The children of Roman Catholics and of all other sects were equally admitted to the benefit of the schools; and very strict care was taken not to give offence to them, or their parents, about the difference of religious opinions."

Archdeacon Thomas Sharp.

His village schools.

Bishop Butler also, in his Durham charge, when insisting that his clergy should urge upon their parishioners the nature and benefits of the Lord's Supper and the importance and necessity of religion, and pointing out the opportunity offered by the duty of parishioners to give notice of intention to partake of the Holy Communion for the first time, thus refers to his archdeacon: "I will only add as to this practice, that it is regularly kept up by some persons, and particularly by one, whose exemplary behaviour in every part of the pastoral life is enforced upon you by his status of authority and influence in (this part especially of) the diocese." This is high praise from such a man.

Butler's opinion of Sharp.

John Sharp, the eldest son of Thomas, became, like his father, Archdeacon of Northumberland, Prebendary of Durham,

and trustee of the Crewe charity at Bamborough. It is in this latter capacity that he did his most notable work. No doubt his father's name carried weight, and he added to it as perpetual curate of Bamborough, a post which he held until his death in 1792. His epitaph, unlike most, gives a too modest description of what he did as senior trustee of Lord Crewe's charity, when it tells us that, "after rendering the ruins of Bamborough Castle habitable, he first established there a free school and dispensary, and also formed a permanent arrangement for the preservation of the lives, and relief of the distress of shipwrecked mariners." In point of fact he carried out at his own expense all the repairs of the principal building of the castle, and bequeathed a sum of money for the maintenance of the fabric, so that the ample funds devised by Lord Crewe might be left intact. He founded the library within the castle, and in it are to be found most of the standard works of his day. He collected the tapestry which adorned the walls, and also the interesting series of portraits, including the beautiful pictures of the two Dorothy Forsters, that of Lord Crewe, and those of Archbishop and Archdeacon Sharp. The portrait of Thomas Sharp is specially striking. He is appropriately painted in the act of relieving a shipwrecked mariner, and looks the ideal of an old-fashioned English divine. Lord Crewe's funds were to be devoted annually by the trustees to the rebuilding of churches, the augmentation of poor livings, the support of schools, and the maintenance of charities at Bamborough itself. A surgery and dispensary were to be maintained for the poor at the castle, and the castle itself was to be manned (if the contradiction may be pardoned) by a regiment of little girls, thirty in number, who were to be elected by the trustees, brought up and instructed within the castle walls, and afterwards provided with an outfit and placed in service.

John Sharp the second.

Granville Sharp (1735-1813), the youngest son of Thomas Sharp, is even better known than his elder brother John, the good archdeacon who did so much for Bamborough. Though he was the grandson of an archbishop, it was not considered at all derogatory to apprentice him to a linen-draper on Tower Hill; and it was only

Granville Sharp.

by his own indefatigable industry, and not through any family influence, that he rose above the level of an ordinary tradesman. In fact, he declined to avail himself of that influence on the only occasion upon which it appears to have been offered. He taught himself Greek and Hebrew, and showed so much intellectual aptitude that his uncle, Granville Wheler, in 1767 offered him the living of Great Leek in Notts if he would take holy orders. This Granville Sharp declined to do, for the same noble reason which in earlier days weighed with the pious Robert Nelson, because he thought he could do better service to the Church as a layman, in which capacity he would not be suspected of interested and professional motives in his work for her.

It is difficult to say whether Granville Sharp did the greater work as a scholar or as a philanthropist. It may seem at the first blush absurd to rate him so highly in the former capacity; for, of course, a man who gained his knowledge mainly through his own unaided efforts, in the scanty leisure snatched from the uncongenial duties of a busy life, could not possibly become a finished scholar.

Yet he propounded a most valuable principle for the interpretation of the Greek of the New Testament, which was, and still is, known as Granville Sharp's Canon. This principle, stated briefly, is that "when two substantives were coupled together, and the definite article preceded only the first, those two substantives always referred to one and the same subject. Thus ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Σωτήρ must mean 'He Who is our God and Saviour'; τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, 'of Him Who is Christ and God,' ὤν and ὄντος being in each case understood." His work as a philanthropist was of a more direct nature. He was the first in the field in the Anti-Slavery crusade. As early as 1765 he began the war by taking under his protection a destitute negro. He manfully maintained in the law courts for several years the cause of personal liberty in England, eliciting at last from the judges the famous dictum "that as soon as any slave sets his foot upon English territory he is free." His pen was constantly at work on the subject of the slave trade and slavery long before the subject was taken up generally. And when in 1787 the Society for the Abolition of Slavery was founded, Granville Sharp was rightly appointed chairman, as

the "father of the movement in England." His fame was rather eclipsed by the efforts of Wilberforce and others in a more influential position than himself, but his unique merit as the pioneer of the movement was not unrecognised. "It ought," said Bishop Porteus, "to be remembered, in justice to one no less remarkable for his modesty and humility than for his learning and piety—Granville Sharp—that the first publication which drew the attention of the country to the horrors of the African slave trade came from his pen."

He probably first conceived the idea of founding a colony for liberated slaves, which led to the famous establishment at Sierra Leone, and he was one of the original directors of the Company formed to manage the settlement. His active and benevolent mind was always at work, not only on this but on other schemes for the amelioration of mankind. He raised an agitation against an attempt to extirpate the aboriginal Carib in the West Indies. He joined heartily in General Oglethorpe's crusade against the pressgangs. He strongly disapproved of the war with the American Colonies, sacrificing his office in the Ordnance Department in consequence; and when the war was over he was most energetic and successful in procuring the consecration of bishops in the Church of the American independent states. Combining "the most inflexible of human wills with the gentlest of human hearts," and brimful of enthusiasm, with perhaps a little touch of eccentricity, he was a great power, and continued to be so for some years after the eighteenth century closed. His career is peculiarly interesting, because he was one of the very few laymen who took an active part in true Christian work between the early years of the century—say, from the death of Robert Nelson in 1715—and its later years, when the Evangelical revival again enlisted Church laymen in its service. For, though he afterwards became intimate, and worked shoulder to shoulder with the Evangelical leaders, especially in the matter of the slave trade, his religious character can hardly be said to have been formed in that school. It took the shape rather of that of his grandfather, father, and elder brother. Granville Sharp's benevolent schemes remind us a little of those of the famous General Oglethorpe, but the latter, though a churchman, was not a prominent figure in the Church life

of the century, at any rate at home, and what has to be said about him will therefore find a more appropriate place in connexion with the missionary and colonial work of the Church.

There were two or three other active churchmen who were rather survivals of the past than the offspring of the period with which this volume is concerned. The most notable of these was William Melmoth (1666-1743), the pious lawyer, whose whole character was formed in an earlier period, but who lingered on until the century had run nearly half its course. The friend of John Norris the Platonist, the correspondent of Archbishop Tenison and Daniel Defoe, carries us back to the Revolutionary rather than the Georgian era. But he was an active Church worker throughout the whole reign of the first George and half of that of the second, being among other things treasurer of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel almost up to the time of his death. The extraordinary popularity of his own work, *The Great Importance of a Religious Life*, which was published anonymously in 1711, and had an immense sale all through the century (it is said that 42,000 copies were sold between 1766 and 1784, and the edition of 1849 affirms that no less than 150,000 copies were sold during the first forty years of the nineteenth century), seems to show that the interest in religion, apart from the Evangelical revival, was not so dead as is commonly supposed.

William Melmoth.

Very much the same may be said of John Chamberlayne (1666-1723), who, however, only lived during nine years of our period. He too was an active member and office-bearer of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, secretary to Queen Anne's Bounty, a writer and translator of several distinctly religious works, most of which appeared during the last nine years of his life. But laymen of the type of Melmoth and Chamberlayne—that is, old-fashioned churchmen who took a real interest in religion and worked for it with their pens or by their personal service—became more and more rare as time went on, until the last decade of the century began.

John Chamberlayne.

One estimable lady, however, belongs to the same category.

Lady Elizabeth Hastings (1682-1739), or, as she was usually called, Lady Betty Hastings, equalled in piety and activity her sister Lady Margaret Hastings, wife of Benjamin Ingham, an Oxford Methodist who joined the Moravians, and her sister-in-law Selina, Countess of Huntingdon; but her religion was of a more distinctly Church type than theirs. This was natural in one who took for her spiritual advisers men like Archbishop Sharp, her diocesan, Robert Nelson, Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man, and William Law. Law valued her so highly that he took her as a special instance of piety in his *Answer to Dr. Trapp*, and after her death desired her sister, Lady Ann Hastings, to draw up an historical account of that blessed lady's spirit, life, and virtue, and this although he had never seen her. He says in his letter: "I have very lately by accident discovered that that good lady had wrote several letters to me without a name, and I can't help thinking with some trouble that I did not then know I had such a correspondent." Bishop Wilson found in her the most liberal supporter of his work in the Isle of Man. She was a celebrated beauty in her youth, and is immortalised in the *Tatler* both by Congreve, under the singularly inappropriate name of "the Divine Aspasia," and by Steele, who paid her in No. 49 what Thackeray calls "the finest compliment ever paid to a lady" in the famous sentence, "to love her is a liberal education." But some will think that the great and good Robert Nelson paid her a still more valuable compliment when he applied to her the text, "Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all." She thoroughly deserved all this praise, for she was a most saintly character, and wholly devoted her ample means to the glory of God and His Church. One of her last acts was to open the church of Holy Trinity at Leeds, which was erected largely through her liberality, and is one of the few churches which date from the second quarter of the eighteenth century. But it may be truly said that her works do follow her, for she left many charitable bequests for Church purposes, amongst others the Hastings' exhibitions at Queen's College, Oxford, as a help to poor students.

Lady Elizabeth Hastings.

But though earnest, active Church workers were few and far between, the vast majority professed to be churchmen to

the backbone. They were only too ready to fight for the Church, to shout for the Church, and above all to drink for the Church, to any extent. As it has been well said: "The most notorious sinners were especially loud, and I believe really fervent, in their expressions of belief; they belaboured freethinkers and stoned imaginary atheists on all sorts of occasions, going out of their way to bawl their own creed and persecute their neighbours, and if they sinned and stumbled, as they constantly did with debt, with drink, with all sorts of bad behaviour, they got upon their knees and cried 'Peccavi' with a most sonorous orthodoxy. Yes, poor Henry Fielding and poor Dick Steele were trusty and undoubting Church of England men; they abhorred Popery, Atheism, and wooden shoes and idolatries in general, and hiccupped Church and State with fervour." "Church and King" was the first and most popular toast at all convivial meetings; but during the whole of the reign of George I., and to a less and constantly diminishing extent during that of his successor, it was exceedingly doubtful which king was meant. John Byrom's quaint quatrain—

Church and King.

> God bless the King, God bless our faith's defender,
> God bless—no harm in blessing—the Pretender;
> But who Pretender is, and who is King,
> God bless us all! that's quite another thing—

was very true, except that in the early years of the Hanoverian dynasty there were very many (including Byrom himself) who had no doubt whatever in their heart of hearts which the Pretender was and which the King.

If the efforts of that very able man, Charles Leslie, to convert the son of James II. to the Church of England had succeeded, the tenure of George I. would not have been worth many years' purchase. But there was the rub. The dread of Popery swallowed up all other feelings, and so long as the claimant for the throne remained "a Papist" he could never have any real chance of success. Secker, in his first charge as Bishop of Oxford, in 1738, tells his clergy "that the controversy between the Papists and us deserves at present to be well studied by such of you as live in the neighbourhood of any; for seldom have they shown more zeal or more artifice

than of late in their attempts of making proselytes." No doubt the fact that Oxford was honeycombed with Jacobitism would render them particularly active and hopeful in that diocese, but they never made any real way. There was much more of what was called "Whig theology," which had a tendency to approach perilously near to Unitarianism in one or other of its forms. In fact, so far as theory went, that seems to be the only direction in which people were really inclined to stray from Church of England orthodoxy. The defence of orthodoxy was signalised in what promises to be its most lasting form by the foundation of the famous Bampton Lectures by John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury (1689-1751), who left his estate for that purpose. The lectures were first delivered in 1780, and with but very rare exceptions have been continued ever since. The estate originally produced £120 a year.

Bampton Lectures.

There was, however, another side of Church life in the eighteenth century, in which it is presented in a more favourable light. A Church which commanded the enthusiastic attachment of such men as Edmund Burke and Dr. Johnson could not be wholly corrupt. The former gives valuable testimony to its hold on the affections of the people, from which only a few sentences can be quoted here. "The majority of the people of England," he writes in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, "far from thinking a religious national Establishment unlawful, hardly think it lawful to be without one. In France you are wholly mistaken if you do not believe us above all other things attached to it, and beyond all other nations; and when this people has acted unwisely and unjustifiably in its favour (as in some instances they have done most certainly), in their very errors you will at least discover their zeal. This principle runs through the whole system of their polity. They do not consider their Church Establishment as convenient, but as essential to their State; not as a thing heterogeneous and separable—something added for accommodation—what they may either keep or lay aside, according to their temporary ideas of convenience. They consider it as the foundation of their whole constitution, with which, and with every part of which, it holds an indissoluble union. Church and State are

Edmund Burke as a churchman.

ideas inseparable in their minds, and scarcely is the one ever mentioned without mentioning the other."

In this fine passage Burke has exactly hit upon the strong points of the Church in the eighteenth century. The nation as a body loved and trusted the national Church. Its very defects, its stagnancy, its secularity, its tendency to compromise, harmonised only too well with the popular feeling. It formed, more perhaps than at most periods, a connecting-link between the different classes of society. The highest did not disdain to accept, and the lower might aspire to attain exalted position among its officers. Frederick Cornwallis, the son of a lord, was succeeded in the primacy by John Moore, the son of a grazier. Of the eight bishops of Durham during our period, six were closely connected with the peerage, but by far the most eminent of all was the son of a linen-draper. William Warburton, the son of a country solicitor, was succeeded at Gloucester by James Yorke, the son of a peer, and there was no incongruity in the succession. Again, the close connexion that then existed between the Church and education was, at least from a churchman's point of view, distinctly beneficial, and Burke touches upon one of its happiest features, which is now nearly obliterated. The relationship between the clerical tutor and his pupil, and often between the patron and his chaplain, was a very close one, and lasted through life. That, for instance, between George Crabbe and the Duke of Rutland, between William Pitt and George Pretyman, between William Wilberforce and Isaac Milner, between William Law and the Gibbon family, was distinctly good for both sides. The clergy, more frequently than is commonly supposed, personally conducted, as a labour of love, the education of the boys of the lower rank who, by their abilities and industry, deserved, in the language of the time, to be "bred scholars."

William Pitt.

With Burke's enthusiastic devotion to and defence of the Church may be placed, by way of contrast, and as illustrating another side of the life of the time, the attitude of William Pitt. His treatment of the Church was on the same lines as his treatment of contemporary political and moral questions. And so, although he recommended Wilberforce to undertake the abolition of the slave trade, and him-

self introduced the motion for the abolition, yet when the opposition grew formidable he would not run the risk of losing office for the sake of the measure he in the first instance had supported. Similarly, he opposed the repeal of the Test Acts, the relief of Unitarians, and very much restricted the limits of the operation of the Catholic Relief Act of 1791. His ecclesiastical appointments were decent, and he had the merit of opposing an unyielding "No" to the many applications of Watson for higher preferment. He was a great statesman, but he was certainly not a great churchman, and his example contributed to make great Church statesmen more and more uncommon in the future. He marks the transition stage between the time when statesmen were ecclesiastics like Wolsey, and the future, when they need not be of any religious profession whatever. Expediency and not righteousness ruled him and crippled his influence for good. Through him the divorce between the ideals of the Church and the State were hastened, and the day of their future reconciliation made yet more distant.

Many of the clergy in the eighteenth century threw themselves into lay pursuits. The extent to which this prevailed is strikingly illustrated in the life of George Crabbe (1754-1832), the poet. When he was chaplain to the Duke of Rutland he endeavoured, against the grain, to adopt the life of his clerical brethren almost as a matter of duty. His son and biographer tells us that, in accordance with the usual habits of the clergy of the Vale of Belvoir, he made some efforts to become a sportsman; but he wanted precision of eye and hand to use the gun with success. Crabbe has himself given us a painfully vivid description of the snares of such a life in *The Village*:

George Crabbe.

> Fain would he ask the parish priest to prove
> His title certain to the joys above:
> For this he sends the murmuring nurse, who calls
> The holy stranger to these dismal walls;
> And doth not he, the pious man, appear,
> He "passing rich with forty pounds a-year"?
> Ah! no: a shepherd of a different stock,
> And far unlike him, feeds this little flock:
> A jovial youth, who thinks his Sunday task
> As much as God or man can fairly ask;
> The rest he gives to loves or labours light,
> To fields the morning, and to feasts the night;

None better skilled the noisy pack to guide,
To urge their chase, to cheer them or to chide;
A sportsman keen, he shoots through half the day,
And, skilled at whist, devotes the nights to play:
Then, while such honours bloom around his head,
Shall he sit sadly by the sick man's bed,
To raise the hope he feels not, or with zeal
To combat fears that e'en the pious feel?

And Cowper, yet more vividly, in the *Progress of Error*:

Oh, laugh or mourn with me the rueful jest,
A cassocked huntsman, and a fiddling priest.

Yet this participation in the sports of laymen, though unseemly, was not wholly evil. The amphibious being, so to speak, whose life was half-lay, half-clerical, was not very far removed either intellectually or morally from the laity with whom he freely consorted, and hence he acquired an influence which from the nature of the case men of a more exclusively ecclesiastical type cannot; and when that influence was exercised, as it sometimes, though too seldom, was, for good, the effect was distinctly beneficial. The clergyman who takes part in the social and athletic side of the life of his parish can often touch natures that would be unaffected by him if he were only to appear before them in his purely spiritual capacity.

This chapter may fitly conclude with a sketch of the part which Dr. Johnson (1709-1784) played in the Church life of the period. In one sense he is even a more valuable witness to the good qualities of the Church of his day than Edmund Burke, for he was more of a representative man. His manliness and robustness of intellect, his strong common-sense, his firm and unwavering conviction of the truth of Christianity, combined with a vivid interest in the affairs of this life, his sturdy independence both of thought and action, his real piety without a tincture of cant or "enthusiasm," were all characteristics of the eighteenth century at its best. Moreover he was a layman, not "a parson in a tye-wig," not one of the ecclesiastical laymen who are more clerical than the clergy. He touched life at many points and mixed with it in many phases. He was not bound to the Church by any ties. His attachment

Samuel Johnson.

to it was purely one of conviction, and all the more valuable on that account. The theory that his churchmanship was only part of his Toryism is discounted by the fact that it existed during the time when Whig theology was predominant; and, moreover, it could hardly have been political, seeing that he had always a strong leaning towards Jacobitism. He had a far higher conception of the Church as a spiritual society than was at all common in his day. He felt indignantly the loss of its power of discussing its own affairs in its own proper assembly. He was one of the few Englishmen who took any interest in the ancient episcopal Church of Scotland, which he saw when travelling in Scotland, and he would never recognise the Presbyterian Establishment, feeling as he did that it is only a spiritual, not a temporal authority which can "establish" a Church. In some matters, as the Intermediate State, he was much in advance of the churchmen of his day, and his unbounded respect for the hierarchy was not so much for the persons as for the office of bishops. In short, he was a much stronger churchman than most of the clergy. Thackeray writes admirably of the position which he held. "I hold old Johnson (and shall we not pardon James Boswell some errors for embalming him for us?) to be the great supporter of the British monarchy and Church during the last age—better than whole benches of bishops, better than Pitts, Norths, and the great Burke himself. Johnson had the ear of the nation: his immense authority reconciled it to loyalty, and shamed it out of irreligion. When George III. talked with him, and the people heard the great author's good opinion of the sovereign, whole generations rallied to the King. Johnson was revered as a sort of oracle; and the oracle declared for Church and King."

Johnson was not only staunch but discriminating in his attachments. He showed that he was fully alive to the defects of the age when he declared that "there were no sermons addressed to the passions worth anything"; and when he owned that bishops were appointed more for political reasons rather than learning and piety, and that the clergy were not remarkable for their pastoral activity. And, on the other hand, he selected its distinctly strong point when he

dwelt upon the services the clergy rendered by their theological writings; and his rebuke to a Presbyterian minister who talked about fat bishops and drowsy deans, "Sir, you know no more of our Church than a Hottentot," was severe, but very just. The eighteenth-century church arrangements quite satisfied him. He was very comfortable in his seat, which he regularly occupied, in the gallery in St. Clement Danes, and the somewhat secular character of his clerical friend, Dr. Taylor, does not seem at all to have shocked him. In short, he was an eighteenth-century man of the best type, and his perfect satisfaction with his Church as it was goes far to explain the undoubted popularity of the Church at a time when it is almost universally regarded as at its lowest ebb. Johnson's devotional writings, which are not sufficiently well known, show him to have been a man of profound personal religious character and conviction, deeply attached to his personal Saviour, while his moral judgments and his actions are marked by a noble heroism and a continued testifying to truth and righteousness in an age which, judged by its secular literature, was none too sensitive.

AUTHORITIES.—For this and the following chapter special attention should be given to the sections in Abbey and Overton on Church Fabrics and Church Services and Church Abuses. *England and the English in the Eighteenth Century, Chapters in the Social History of the Times*, by William Connor Sydney, 2 vols. 1892, contains a very full account of the general life of the period, including that of the religious world. Canon Venables has written in the *Lincoln Diocesan Magazine* the story of the life of that diocese. For Richard Graves, see his *Works*, edited by his son, 4 vols. 1840. An excellent account of Richard Graves has recently been written by the Rev. W. H. Hutton in his *Burford Papers*, 1905. The Sharps will be found adequately treated in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* See also the *Life of Archbishop Sharp*, edited by his son Newcome, 2 vols. 1825. The fiction of the period should also be consulted, especially Richardson, Fielding, Sterne, Goldsmith, and, of course, the Essayists. Crabbe is best studied in Canon Ainger's volume in the English Men of Letters series, and in his *Poetical Works and Letters*, edited by his son, 8 vols. 1838. Boswell's *Johnson*, Dr. Birkbeck Hill's *Dr. Johnson, his Friends and his Critics*, Thomas Seccombe's *Age of Johnson*, and the *Johnson Club Papers* will be sufficient guide to the life and literature relating to the great lexicographer. For Edmund Burke, see his *Works*, and John Morley in English Men of Letters series.

CHAPTER XVIII

CHURCH FABRICS AND SERVICES

It is a strange thing that professing, in all sincerity, so strong an attachment to their Church, the men of our era should have been content to have its system so miserably and inadequately presented, and to show such practical neglect of it. To begin with the fabrics. It might at least have been expected that when the Church was in one sense so strong, the existing fabrics would have been kept in decent repair, and new ones erected where they were obviously required. But never was there a time in which churches were, as a rule, in so disgraceful a state, never a time when so few new churches were built. The early years of the eighteenth century were a time when church building was very successfully carried out, but the interval between them and its close was all but a blank. There is something to admire in the Queen Anne churches; but the churches built between 1714 and 1801 that are at all noteworthy could be counted on the fingers of two hands. Briefs were occasionally issued for the building of churches, but the results, small in all cases, were, as Secker said, "extremely small" in these instances. Perhaps from an artistic point of view it may be said that the fewer churches built the better at a time when taste in ecclesiastical architecture was so degenerate. Certainly the few specimens of churches built during this period do not make us regret that there are not more, but their paucity is a painful indication of the deadness of the Church life. Under the rule of Walpole England enjoyed an almost unexampled spell of peace and outward

Church fabrics.

prosperity. The nation seemed to be so rich that it had nothing better to do with its money than to throw it away on the most ridiculous projects, of which the South Sea Scheme, before Walpole's long ministry, was the most notable, but only one out of many. But it never seems to have occurred to the people that it might have been more profitably spent on the fabrics of that Church to which the great majority professed to be devotedly attached.

When an effort was made in that direction, it generally resulted in a signal instance of how not to do it. For example, the Royal Supremacy has no doubt been accepted by the Church of England, but it was not a happy piece of symbolism to illustrate this by a full-length figure of King George I. surmounting the spire of St. George's, Bloomsbury, where it stands to this day, and gave rise to the epigram :

St. George, Bloomsbury.

> When Harry the Eighth left the Pope in the lurch,
> The Protestants made him the Head of the Church ;
> But George's good subjects, the Bloomsbury people,
> Instead of the Church, made him head of the steeple.

This steeple figures in the background of Hogarth's "Gin Lane." Nor was it a happy thought, in 1726, to convert the Banqueting Hall at Whitehall into a Chapel Royal. The ceiling, painted by Rubens, well deserves to be admired ; but Rubens was not a spiritually minded artist, and the subject—the Apotheosis of King James I. —though a religious one, is not altogether suggestive of reverential feelings, nor are indeed the allegorical figures introduced in the scene. It is a matter of taste, but it may be doubted whether many at the present day would share the feeling of admiration with which the good Vicar of Leeds in 1723 regarded the improvement of the parish church, which he thus vividly describes to Ralph Thoresby : "Our altar-piece is further adorned, since you went, with three flower-pots upon three pedestals upon the wainscot, gilt, and a hovering dove upon the middle one : three cherubs over the middle panel, the middle one gilt, a piece of open carved work beneath, going down towards the middle of the velvet," though he would probably agree with

Chapel Royal, Whitehall.

Leeds.

what follows: "But the greatest ornament is a choir well filled with devout communicants."

Nor was the great extension of the pew system, and its introduction into country churches, in many of which it had not existed before, by any means a wise way of spending money on churches. The same may be said of some of the galleries in churches, many of which date from this period, especially after the Evangelical revival had begun to attract to church more people, for whom accommodation had to be provided. As a general rule, however, the churches did not suffer so much from the well-meaning but ill-directed expenditure of money upon them as from the shameful neglect of spending any money at all. Bishop Secker's fourth charge, delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Oxford in 1750, discloses a sad state of things. His description is one which may be thoroughly depended upon, because Secker was personally the last man to make an exaggerated statement for the sake of producing an effect. His temperament was calm and judicial. So far from being a pessimist as regards the Church, he seems to have taken too lenient a view of its shortcomings in his day, thinking that the Church was doing all that it could do to remedy the decadence of religion which he so bitterly deplores. A bishop's charge is an authoritative document, and no bishop, least of all a cautious one like Secker, would affirm what he could not substantiate, especially in a matter in which he could at once be contradicted if what he alleged were untrue. Moreover, the diocese of Oxford, the centre of which was the University, then more closely connected with the Church than it is now, would presumably be one which would be above rather than below the average. His remarks, therefore, on church fabrics in general and chancels in particular carry weight.

Secker's fourth charge.

He discusses the repair of chancels, as being the most sacred part of the church. The ancient Christians had imitated the precedents on the one hand of the heathen taught only by the light of nature, and on the other hand of the Jews taught by God Himself by express and minute directions, to provide for the beauty of the sanctuary. This may have been carried too far in later ages, but in England at any rate for several generations past

Chancels.

there had been no danger from excess in that direction. Neglect had been so marked as to give "Papists an exceeding great disgust to Protestantism," and to cause infidels to have no small contempt of Christians as "either despising inwardly the religion they profess or being too sordid to pay it the common outward marks of respect." The blame for this lies upon laity and clergy alike, but primarily upon the clergy, and especially upon rectors as responsible for the repair of the chancels. The clergy were free from the burden of being responsible for the whole fabric, but that should make them bear the lesser burden the more cheerfully. They ought to be content the rather to follow simplicity and plainness of appearance in their own houses and to adorn the sanctuary. But the facts were the other way round. The church was neglected and made to take a secondary place. Here is his description:—"Water undermining and rotting the foundations; earth heaped up against the outside, weeds and shrubs growing against them or trees too near them. The floors are meanly paved, or the walls dirty or patched, or the windows ill-glazed, and it may be in part stopped up, or the roof not ceiled; or they are damp, offensive, and unwholesome for the want of a due circulation of air." Taste was improving in the world round about them. It was not for the Church to lag behind and to give offence. Three years later, in his fifth charge (1753), he returns to the subject, and intimates, what is confirmed from other sources, that even the little money that was gathered for church buildings and repairs was not all spent upon the object for which it was intended.

From Secker let us turn to his bosom friend Bishop Butler, a man whose accuracy is, if possible, still further above suspicion. This is the way in which he speaks of the state of churches in his charge to the clergy of the diocese of Durham in 1751:—"And doubtless under this head must come into consideration a proper regard to the structures which are consecrated to the service of God. In the present turn of the age, one may observe a wonderful frugality in everything which has respect to religion, and extravagance in everything else. But amidst the appearance of opulence and improvement in all common things, which are now seen in most places, it would be hard to find a reason why these monuments of ancient

piety should not be preserved in their original beauty and magnificence. But in the least opulent places they must be preserved in becoming repair; and everything relating to the Divine service be, however, decent and clean; otherwise we shall vilify the face of religion whilst we keep it up. All this is indeed principally the duty of others. Yours is to press strongly upon them what is their duty in this respect, and admonish them of it often, if they are negligent. But then you must be sure to take care and not neglect that part of the sacred fabric which belongs to you to maintain in repair and decency. Such neglect would be great impiety in you, and of most pernicious example to others. Nor could you, with any success, or any propriety, urge upon them their duty in a regard in which you yourselves should be openly neglectful of it." He goes on to refer to a charge delivered by Bishop Fleetwood of St. Asaph in 1710, and after commending what that excellent prelate then said on the duty of building, repairing, and adorning churches, declared that matters were even worse at present than they had been forty years before, and recalls the warning that if not attended to, sixty years' further neglect would bring to the ground a huge number of our churches.

The case of Bishop Butler himself suggests another reason, besides parsimony and carelessness, for the neglect of church fabrics. He practised what he preached, and had set a good example, as we have seen in a former chapter, of caring for the place in which God is worshipped, when he was Bishop of Bristol, and of doing it in a way much more in accordance with good taste and the fitness of things than was usual in that day. But it had laid him open to the charge of Popery. King George, too, had objected to painting St. Paul's, as a Popish practice. Many of the churches were whitewashed. Their beauties were concealed, but they were also preserved for an age more capable of appreciating them. Though the result might be less mischievous, it does not make more excusable the conduct of those who shamefully neglected the duty of keeping the House of God in seemly or even decent repair. Innumerable instances of such neglect might be cited, but the testimony of two such men as Secker and Butler speaking *ex cathedra* are perhaps sufficient for our

purpose. It may be added that this glaring abuse was the last to be remedied, and the reason is obvious. Though there were many good men of other schools, it was, after all, mainly from those who were affected directly or indirectly by the Evangelical revival that practical reform came in the eighteenth century; and the Evangelicals were not the sort of men to inaugurate reform either in what Butler calls "external religion" generally or of church fabrics in particular. Symbolism and aestheticism were not in their line. So long as there was space enough to accommodate comfortably the people to whom they preached the Gospel, that was sufficient.

Perhaps less attention was paid to the churches because, truth to tell, with the exception of those in the hands of the Evangelicals, people were not often in them. A growing paucity of services was a marked characteristic of the Georgian era. So far as London was concerned, we have at the close of Queen Anne's reign in 1714 Paterson's *Pietas Londinensis*, which gives us full and most interesting statistics of the church services and the attendance at them. In 1824 a similar work was published which presents a most powerful contrast in favour of the earlier date. This is all the more remarkable because the turn of the tide had set in a full quarter of a century before 1824, and if statistics had been given for fifty or sixty years earlier, they would assuredly have shown a worse record.

What is said about London applies still more forcibly to the country at large; and in the case of Church services as of Church fabrics, though there are exceptions. The later part of our period does not show any marked improvement on the earlier, for here again the Evangelical revival did not produce much effect. It tended rather to encourage cottage lectures and meetings of private societies, in which extemporary prayers could be used, than increased facilities for what used to be called the "stated worship" of the Church. In fact, in this respect it is by no means certain whether matters did not grow worse rather than better. Daily services, which had been customary in large towns and even villages during the reign of Queen Anne, lingered on during that of her successor and were then

Church services.

gradually dropped. Wednesday and Friday services were still continued. But daily service, such as that at Huntingdon, which Cowper and the Unwins attended, grew scarce. As to Sundays, in many parts of the country alternate services morning and evening (or rather afternoon) were a necessity when a clergyman served two or even more churches, as he frequently did, more frequently at the close of our period probably than at the beginning. And when there were two services, there was, as a rule, only one sermon, in the morning, according to the canon. The Evangelicals, who made much of preaching, always had a second sermon, so far as we can ascertain; but, on the other hand, the clergymen who disagreed with them made a stronger point than ever of only having one, regarding the afternoon sermon as an unauthorised Methodistical innovation.

One of the worst features of all was the extreme infrequency of the highest service, the Holy Communion; and here again there seems to have been no improvement as the years went on. But at the few celebrations that were held there were very many more communicants than there are at present, especially among the Evangelicals, who, though they did not take high views of the nature of the Sacrament, laid great stress upon the importance of the ordinance, and expected as a matter of course all "the serious" to be partakers of it. The Fasts and Festivals of the Church were sadly neglected. Saints' days were all but ignored. Lent and even Holy Week were little observed, though from time to time efforts were made to revive the observance. Even Good Friday was becoming like other days, until Bishop Porteus made a very successful attempt to restore it to what it ought to be, in London and the neighbourhood. "While Rector of Lambeth he published a letter on the universal neglect of Good Friday, which is said to have made a very marked impression both in London and Westminster. There never had been known such general observance of this day in closing of shops and in attendance on religious services as on the Good Friday subsequent to the publication of this letter." Ascension Day, too, was generally ignored. On the other hand, public Fasts and Thanksgivings, by order of Parliament or of the King in Council, were far more frequent than

they are now, especially in the early part of the period. And with regard to the good old canonical custom of catechising in church at the afternoon service, not only children, but servants and apprentices, the practice by degrees was dropped except in Lent, and then altogether. The rapid spread of the Sunday School system certainly tended to make catechising rare, and at the close of the century it was the exception rather than the rule.

Psalmody had sunk to the lowest ebb in parish churches, where Tate and Brady or Sternhold and Hopkins reigned supreme, if there was any singing at all. There was a strong prejudice among "the orthodox" against all hymns, those taken from mediaeval sources being regarded as Popish, and English ones as Methodistical or chiefly written by dissenters; and it was no small help to the success of the Methodists that they sang, not the old-fashioned paraphrases and doggerel verses of a former generation, but hymns which were instinct with the new life of the movement, and which, proceeding from hearts filled with a deep sense of the Divine presence, were caught up and repeated by converts full of the fire of love. The Evangelicals followed suit and introduced hymn-books of varying merit; but these in point of numbers, though not of influence, were but a small minority, and Bishop Porteus did not exaggerate when he said in 1790, "Psalmody is now almost totally useless to the Church of England." At the same time our modern hymnody dates largely from this period. Many of the best writers of hymns were dissenters, notably Isaac Watts and Philip Doddridge. One of our noblest hymns, "The God of Abraham praise," we owe to a shoemaker, Thomas Olivers, converted under Whitefield, and afterwards one of Wesley's assistants. To Edward Perronet, son of the Vicar of Shoreham, who became the minister of a dissenting congregation, the Church is indebted for the favourite, "All hail the power of Jesu's Name." Byrom, however, wrote "My spirit longeth for Thee," and Toplady, "Rock of Ages." Romaine did not write any hymns, as he objected strongly to them on the ground that they were man's poetry, human compositions; but he versified some of the Psalms with a view to the improvement of congregational singing. John Newton will always be remembered by his "Love divine, all

love excelling." The music suitable for such hymns as were then written should also be noted. Some of our finest tunes come from this time. They are more simple and severe in their structure than our contemporary ones, and they have a charm which is all their own. Some have been altered for the worse. The original form of the tune to "Jesus Christ is risen to-day," which dates from 1708 and therefore was not composed by Dr. Worgan, nor first played by him on the organ in St. Botolph, Aldgate, is much superior to its modern descendant.

Other evidence goes to prove the general lack of Church feeling during the century. First, there is the negative evidence of sermons. Sermon literature bore a larger proportion to other literature than it does at the present day. We have innumerable volumes of printed sermons, and many of them are of great value. There is a robustness and manliness both of style and matter in the best of them which might with advantage be studied by our own contemporary preachers, but they leave the general impression that the Church system was very imperfectly carried out. Scarcely one can be found which presents fully the round of Fast and Festival from Advent to Advent, and comparatively few which dwell distinctly on the different seasons of the Church. Take some of the most notable—as those of Thomas Sherlock, a very powerful preacher on the intellectual side; or of Thomas Secker, a plain, practical one; or of Samuel Ogden, the favourite preacher of George III. and of Dr. Johnson, whose opinion is of more weight than that of any king; or of Jeremiah Seed, another favourite of the great doctor—they all give the impression that worship was a Sunday exercise, except indeed on such days as January 30, November 5, and special days appointed by a secular authority, which are not Church seasons at all. Or take the great preachers of the rising Evangelical school—John Newton, or Joseph Milner, or Isaac Milner, or Thomas Scott, or Thomas Gisborne. Perhaps it is unreasonable to expect that the good men of this type of thought would present the Church system in its fulness. At any rate, they certainly did not. Another evidence is actually visible to eyes that can see. Let any one look round in any part of the country and he will see how very few traces there are of church building or church repair, except in the way

Sermons.

of disfigurement, in the existing fabrics which belong to our era.

And, finally, there is the direct evidence of episcopal charges. The testimony of Bishops Butler and Secker as to Church fabrics in the middle of the century has already been cited. Bishops Porteus and Horsley, who can be absolutely relied upon, do not give us a much brighter picture towards its close when dealing with services. About Sunday services the former writes in his charge to the diocese of London in 1790: "I observe that in general, throughout the county of Essex at least, there is service only once in the day. In most other dioceses, I believe, it is different. In that from which I came there were through a very considerable part of it, and that even in the smallest parishes, not only prayers but a sermon both parts of the day. I do not mean to require this of you; but I do very earnestly recommend it to you in general to have a sermon once and prayers twice in the day." He goes on: "On the due observance of Sunday depends, I am convinced, the very existence of religion in this country. Scarce one symptom even appears among us, except on the Lord's Day; and when the sanctity of that is gone, everything is gone with it. . . . Sunday Schools have, I observe, made their way but very slowly into this diocese, and are yet found but in very few parts of it; in London and Westminster I believe not at all (but multitudes of Charity Schools, but these comprehend but a very small part of the children of the poor). In Manchester I believe the Sunday Schools contain not less than 5000 children." Bishop Horsley, in his charge to the diocese of Rochester, bears powerful testimony on other points noted above. "The Festivals and Fasts of the Church," he says, "are, I fear, not without some connivance of the clergy, gone too much into oblivion and neglect. There can be no excuse for the neglect of the Feast of our Lord's Nativity, and the stated Fasts of Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, even in the smallest country parishes; but in towns and the more populous villages the church ought certainly to be opened for worship on the forenoon at least of every day in the Passion Week, of the Mondays and Tuesdays of Easter Week and Whitsuntide, on the Epiphany, and on some, if not all, of the other Festivals." And to quote one

more episcopal testimony, Bishop Tomline, then Dean of St. Paul's as well as Bishop of Lincoln, laments that, being in St. Paul's on Easter Day 1800, "in that vast and noble Cathedral no more than six persons were found at the Table of the Lord." Cathedral life, it is true, was not then what it has become in our own day, and, moreover, many of the City churches were then living centres and had in some cases very large numbers of communicants.

In nothing, perhaps, was the degenerate condition of the life, both of the Church and of the State shown than in the long-continued scandal of the Fleet marriages, which were conducted in the chapel of the Fleet Prison by the clerical prisoners, of whom, sad to say, there was generally a large number. So common was the practice of clandestine marriage, that between October 1704 and February 1705 no fewer than 2950 such marriages are recorded. From the Fleet Prison the practice spread to the surrounding neighbourhood, and the numerous ale-houses, taverns, gin and brandy shops were used for this purpose, especially after the Act of Queen Anne taking away the right of marriage from the Fleet Prison chapel. Lord Hardwicke's Act, which came into force on March 26, 1754, rendered thereafter the solemnisation of matrimony by a priest in any place not a church or public chapel, without a licence or the publication of banns, null and void, and such clergy as solemnised them guilty of an act of felony, and punishable on conviction with transportation for fourteen years. It is an interesting reflection on the public opinion of the time to note that on March 25, 1754, the last day before the Act came into operation, no fewer than two hundred and seventeen marriages were entered into one Fleet register-book alone.

Fleet marriages.

Authorities. — In addition to those cited in the last chapter, the *Charges* of Secker and Butler should be consulted. The Fleet marriages are dealt with by W. Connor Sydney in his *England and the English in the Eighteenth Century*. For Hymns see C. J. Abbey's chapter in Abbey and Overton's *English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, and Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*. The original forms of some hymn tunes will be found in Woodward's *Songs of Syon*.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL MOVEMENT

THE beginning of the modern Sunday School movement is clearly marked as dating from the year 1780. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the religious education of children on the Lord's Day, or even their education in what were to all intents and purposes Sunday Schools, only dates from so short a time ago. It is not clear to what extent, if any, the movement set on foot in S. Maria Maggiore in Rome by the archpriest, Cardinal S. Carlo Borromeo, spread beyond Rome and Milan, but Borromeo was unquestionably the real founder of Sunday Schools, and they are still to be seen in their primitive form in many Italian churches. And in England, in the closing years of the seventeenth century and up to 1714, there was a religious revival on far more distinctively Church lines than the revival in the later part of the eighteenth century, and the care of the young on the Lord's Day naturally formed a very conspicuous feature. It was then that a large number of those Charity Schools, in which the young were clothed and fed as well as educated, were founded. The religious training was strictly on the lines of the Church of England. Attendance at church in procession was always part of the scheme, and the founders and supporters were almost without exception pious and consistent churchmen.

Sunday Schools.

Their spread was rapid and very extensive. Within five years, between 1699 and 1704, no fewer than fifty such schools were established in London and the suburbs, and the number of children educated may be judged by the fact that on the

arrival of King George I. in London in 1714 more than 4000 children were assembled to witness the new sovereign's entry, and to greet him with the psalm which bids the king rejoice in the strength of the Lord, and be exceeding glad in His salvation. The interest taken by good churchmen in Christian education is forcibly illustrated by the fact that these children were marshalled by Robert Nelson, the admirable author of *Festivals and Fasts*, who was a Non-Juror, and therefore could not accept the Hanoverian king, but whose interest in the children for this once overcame his political prejudices. Steele, in the *Spectator*, thus describes these institutions: "I was last Sunday highly transported at our parish church. The gentleman in the pulpit pleaded movingly in behalf of the poor children, and they for themselves much more movingly by singing a hymn." This was in 1712. Two years later, when the Georgian era set in, the schools, like many other good works, began to languish, partly on account of the general apathy which pervaded the nation, and partly because a ridiculous report was spread that the schools were abused to inculcate Jacobite principles. Still, they did not cease to exist, and some few were founded in the reigns of the first two Georges. William Law founded a school at King's Cliffe which was to be conducted on the strictest Church principles, and provided for the education of the children on Sundays as well as on week-days, and he expressly stipulated that they should be present at every service held in the Church.

Then, again, the duty of public catechising every Sunday not only young children, but also servants and apprentices, according to the 59th Canon, was continually being impressed upon the clergy. There is hardly a bishop's charge in the later part of the seventeenth and the earlier part of the eighteenth century which does not lay stress upon the performance of this duty. It was performed in far more cases than is commonly supposed, sometimes after the sermon, sometimes instead of the sermon, every Sunday afternoon. Thus at Epworth Samuel Wesley carefully kept it up until his death in 1735. Bishop Wilson, in the Isle of Man, exacted a fine from those who did not attend. The Manx discipline was not enforced in the adjacent Isle of Great Britain, but episcopal inquisition was not exercised in vain.

Catechising.

Thus religious instruction in its most regular and canonical form was not wanting in the days before Sunday Schools, and Sunday Schools themselves, though the name was not known, certainly existed in fact before 1780. In some cases instruction was given in the parvise, that is, the room over the church porch, either by the clergy themselves or by their deputies. The first Sunday School, actually so called, was established, so far as can be ascertained, by a clergyman, whose creed was anything but orthodox, Theophilus Lindsey. This was in 1765. There was also certainly one which had the name, in 1769, at High Wycombe, which was established by a pious lady named Hannah Ball. And there were others.

This preliminary sketch is not intended to detract from the merits of the good man who, if not the actual originator, was at any rate the first to bring prominently before the public the scheme which has ever since formed so essential a feature in all parochial organisations. Robert Raikes (1735-1811) was the proprietor of a Gloucester newspaper. Being much distressed at the rude and noisy behaviour of the children in the streets of Gloucester, he spoke to one of the clergy, Thomas Stock, then the curate and afterwards Rector of St. John the Baptist, Gloucester, about it. Due justice has perhaps never been done to this good clergyman, who was the first suggester of the Sunday School scheme, though he would never have spread the idea but for Raikes, who had peculiar opportunities of making it known. Stock's own simple and modest account of the matter is as follows: "Mr. Raikes, meeting me one day by accident at my own door, and in the course of conversation lamenting the deplorable state of the lower classes of mankind, took particular notice of the situation of the poorer children. I had made, I replied, the same observation, and told him if he would accompany me into my own parish we would make some attempts to remedy the evil. We immediately proceeded to the business, and procuring the names of about ninety children, placed them under the care of four persons for a stated number of hours on the Sunday. As minister of the parish, I took upon me the superintendence of the schools and one-third of the expense. The progress of this institution throughout the kingdom is

Robert Raikes.

Thomas Stock.

justly to be attributed to the constant representations which Mr. Raikes made in his own paper, the *Gloucester Journal*, of the benefits which he perceived would probably arise from it." The inscription on Stock's tomb in his church states that he and Raikes "established and supported the four original Sunday Schools in this parish and in St. Catherine's in 1780," which is, it will be observed, a year earlier than the date commonly given.

It might well take a year in those days, when news travelled slowly, to make known an institution only established in a provincial town. Raikes survived Thomas Stock nearly thirty years, long enough to see his scheme adopted throughout the length and breadth of the land. It was not his fault that the clergy did not have their full share of credit in floating the scheme. He wrote in the *Gloucester Journal* of November 3, 1783: "Some of the clergy in different parts of this country, bent upon attempting a reform among the children of the lower class, are establishing Sunday Schools for rendering the Lord's Day subservient to the ends of instruction, which has hitherto been prostituted to bad purposes. Farmers and other inhabitants of the towns and villages complain that they receive more injury in their property on the Sabbath than all the week besides; this in a great measure proceeds from the lawless state of the younger class, who are allowed to run wild on that day, free from every restraint. To remedy this evil, persons duly qualified are employed to instruct those that cannot read, and those that may have learned to read are taught the Catechism and conducted to Church. By thus keeping their minds engaged, the day passes profitably and not disagreeably." From this account it will be gathered that Raikes was himself a loyal churchman. He was a regular communicant at Gloucester Cathedral, and we can well understand the annoyance which his son felt on hearing it reported that his father had been a dissenter, a report which he somewhat indignantly contradicted. Possibly the idea may have arisen because the Sunday School scheme was warmly taken up by the Methodists. But it must be remembered that in those days the Methodists were distinctly and avowedly a part of the Church.

The movement spread widely and rapidly. John Wesley,

in his *Journal* for July 18, 1784, speaks of the Sunday School at Otley, which is at the other end of England from Gloucestershire, and adds, "I find these schools springing up wherever I go." Hannah More was wonderfully successful in establishing in the teeth of bitter opposition many Sunday as well as week-day schools in the neighbourhood of Cheddar and Cowslip Green. John Fletcher of Madeley had most flourishing schools both at Madeley itself and at Madeley Wood, a large hamlet within his parish, and that as early as 1782. At Nether Stowey, a village near the Quantocks in Somerset, immortalised as the residence of Coleridge and Wordsworth in their early manhood, a most successful Sunday School was established before 1790, under the care of the rector, Dr. Majendie. A letter written to him by Thomas Poole, who was a sort of Maecenas to the two poets before they had become generally known, gives a curious insight into the management of Sunday Schools. On December 15, 1792, he writes: "We had a meeting of subscribers to the Sunday Schools. We regretted the absence of the principal supporter of those noble institutions, but trust he will approve of the measures on which we determined—which were to purchase the boys a new coat and hat each, and the girls a hat to wear on Sundays. We hope to get their clothes ready by Christmas Day. As a further inducement, we proposed giving to each child who attends the school without one omission a penny on the first Sunday of every month. And this," he adds, rather unnecessarily, "operates very powerfully. We should be truly reprehensible did we not exert ourselves to carry into effect those institutions to which you, sir, give such liberal, such unprecedented support." In the neighbouring village of Over Stowey, where John Poole, cousin of Thomas, a fellow of Oriel and a man of some distinction, was rector, the Sunday Schools were still more flourishing. These examples will suffice to show how rapidly they spread within the first ten years of their establishment. Before the end of the century they had become the rule, not the exception, in almost every well-worked parish in England.

Spread of Sunday Schools.

Passing mention should be made of Mrs. Sarah Trimmer (1741-1810), the authoress of the once popular and famous catechism, so cruelly gibbeted by Sydney Smith in the *Edin-*

burgh Review, but which did good in its day. She pleaded forcibly for Sunday Schools, and especially for the distinctively Church character of those which professed to be Church schools. It is interesting to note the interest taken in Mrs. Trimmer by the Court. Mrs. Trimmer was sent for by the Queen, received with the most gracious kindness, and questioned as to the mode of carrying on Sunday Schools, which her Majesty was anxious to establish at Windsor. The conference lasted two hours. Madame D'Arblay in her *Diary* twice refers to the personal sympathy of the Queen. "My royal mistress was all condescension to me. She gave me Mrs. Trimmer's excellent book of the *Economy of Charity*." And again: "Afterwards, when I attended her at noon, she spoke to me a great deal of Mrs. Trimmer, that excellent instructress and patroness of children and the poor; and she made me a present of her last two little books, called *The Servant's Friend* and *The Two Farmers*." The publication of *Adele et Theodore* by Madame de Genlis in 1787 suggested to Mrs. Trimmer the idea of having prints engraved which should depict various events in ancient history, sacred and secular, and pasted on cardboard, in order to hang them up in nurseries. The cardboard was afterwards abandoned, and the prints bound up in small volumes. In her home at Brentford she had taught her own large family and those of some of her relations on the method she desired to see adopted in Sunday Schools. Stackhouse's *Commentary*, with its numerous engravings and illuminated maps of the Holy Land, was eagerly examined and clearly explained, so that the day became to the young children one of genuine enjoyment and of spiritual profit.

Mrs. Trimmer.

More importance is to be attached to the work of Andrew Bell (1753-1832), a man whose name was at one time in every one's mouth, but who is now almost entirely forgotten. He was the founder of a system of education, and the cause of the foundation of the National Society. A parishioner thus wrote of what was perhaps the earliest instance of a Sunday School anniversary at Bell's schools at Swanage, where he was rector: "It was held at the rectory, Dr. Bell, who loved children, helping to amuse

Dr. Bell.

them. There were 75 boys and 117 girls. In the afternoon they assembled before the Rev. Dr. Bell's house, where they received their usual civility and kindness from that benevolent gentleman. All the gentry, both far and near, attended on the occasion, and seemed very well pleased to see and hear the children read, and I think the people in general have more regard for that laudable institution than ever." Such details have a peculiar interest as pictures of the past.

It must not be supposed that when the Sunday School scheme was well afloat it was all plain sailing. Far from it. Besides the obstacles which are raised against any good work, simply because it is good, it had also to contend against the prejudices, not even yet extinct, but far more rampant in the eighteenth century, against all education of the lower orders as tending to unfit them for the commonplace duties of their after life. Then, again, the fears inspired by the French Revolution, which made people afraid of any innovation whatever, worked against the new scheme of Sunday Schools. And this prejudice raised against them affected not only the illiterate, but even men of the highest intellectual calibre. Bishop Horsley, who was a head and shoulders above any bishop or clergyman living at the close of the eighteenth century, distinctly intimates that there was some ground for alarm on this score. He thinks there is "much ground for suspicion that sedition and atheism are the real objects of some of these institutions rather than religion." Horsley was the last man to speak without book, and there may have been some good reason, not now discoverable, for what he said. But it did not prevent him from urging his clergy to set on foot good schools. "By all means in your power promote this establishment in your parishes. I have always spoken of them, and always shall speak, as institutions that may be very beneficial or very pernicious according as they are well or ill conducted, and placed in proper or improper hands." Even Bishop Porteus, who was justly regarded as a great patron of Sunday Schools, was cautious about joining the movement. At first "he did not," writes his biographer, "give it his public approbation, till time and experience and more accurate inquiry had enabled him to form a more decided judgment of its real

Bishop Horsley on the Schools.

Bishop Porteus.

value and probable effects. Then he addressed a letter to his clergy in the London Diocese giving them an exposition of the advantages of Sunday Schools, and of the rules by which they should be conducted." On the whole, the scheme was well backed up, both by the Bench and by the clergy generally.

Finance.

Another difficulty, undoubtedly, was the providing of ways and means. This, with our notions of Sunday Schools, may seem rather hard to understand. It does not appear a very ruinous outlay to start a Sunday School, and for some time it was a puzzle to discover why the generosity of those who founded them at their own cost should so frequently be commented upon by their contemporaries. But the fact is, that a Sunday School in those early days was something very different from what it is now. An extract from a charge of Bishop Porteus will show how serious an affair it was. "I should think that four, or at the most five hours would be confinement fully sufficient for children engaged during the week in trade or manufacture. In villages where they are, of course, more in the open air during the whole week, a little more time may be taken for instruction in the morning or evening." The Sunday School, then, in many cases supplied the whole of the child's education, and he was there taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as religious knowledge. This cost money, for it must not be supposed that all this education was given by volunteer teachers.

AUTHORITIES.—See lives of S. Carlo Borromeo, Robert Raikes (that by A. Gregory is the best), and Mrs. Trimmer. See also Madame D'Arblay's *Diary*, the best edition of which is that by Austin Dobson, Hodson's *Life of Bishop Porteus*, and Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vols. iii. and vii. (cabinet ed.).

CHAPTER XX

COLONIAL AND MISSIONARY WORK

In estimating the work done by the Church in the colonial and mission field during the eighteenth century, it is only fair to remember that it was a new and tentative task which it was taking in hand. The first serious and systematic effort only dates from the first year of the century, when the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (the S.P.G.) was founded, or rather when it became a distant and separate branch of the noble project formed three years before by the institution of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (the S.P.C.K.). There had, of course, been isolated and unsystematic attempts made before to provide for the spiritual wants of our countrymen in the plantations and to Christianise the heathen by whom they were surrounded. But it is astonishing how small a space such subjects occupy in the writings, and therefore we may assume in the thoughts, even of good churchmen in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. When, then, the S.P.G. began its glorious task, it was practically beginning a new thing; and from its very foundation traces may be found of the tentative and experimental nature of its efforts, and traces also of the character of the time at which it took its rise. The time was the Revolution era, when William III. was on the throne, and when what was called Whig theology was in the ascendency; when Latitudinarian and Erastian ideas were taking the place of those which prevailed during what has been rightly termed the golden age of English theology. Beginning its operations at such a time, it is wonderful that it conducted them in so Church-like a

The S.P.G.

manner as it did; nevertheless, it is idle to deny that from a churchman's point of view its method was not what it would have been in more congenial times.

A Church may be built up in two ways. You may begin from below or you may begin from above. In other words, you may begin by gathering individuals and, when sufficient numbers are banded together, setting a head over them; or you may begin by appointing a head with other members about him, and then drawing individuals round the centre. The latter is now the plan on which our missions are conducted; the former was the plan adopted by our earlier missions, by the S.P.G. at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and by the Church Missionary Society (the C.M.S.) at the beginning of the nineteenth. The idea was first to form your society and then set a bishop over it; not first appoint your bishop and then gather your society about him. For many years the result was most disastrous. The colonial and missionary work began without a bishop, and it continued without a bishop for the greater part of a century. To say that this was like acting the play of Hamlet with the character of the Prince of Denmark omitted, would be to understate the case. Bishops are necessary to the Church of England. It cannot exist without them. It would cease to be an episcopal Church and would become something else. "It is evident to all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." But this is just what was not evident in the Church in the colonial and the mission fields of the eighteenth century. "Ye are to take care that this child be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him," says the minister to the sponsors after the child has been admitted into the Church. But this could not be done. There were no bishops within three thousand miles to whom the child could be brought. It was idle to pray that the bishops might "lay hands suddenly on no man," or "make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of the Church," when there was no one to lay hands, suddenly or advisedly, on persons fit or unfit.

Rival methods of work.

It may seem strange that an age which above all things

prided itself upon being "the age of reason" should not have perceived the unreasonableness, in fact, the absurdity of the situation. But the explanation suggests another element of weakness in the work of the Church abroad. It was far too much tied and bound in the chain of politics. It was the State and not the Church that was the obstacle to the remedying of the monstrous anomaly of an episcopal society without a bishop. One of the earliest missionaries of the S.P.G., the Rev. John Talbot, wrote in 1702, within a year of its foundation, from New York: "There are earnest addresses from divers parts of the Continent and Islands adjacent for a Suffragan to visit the several churches; ordain some, confirm others, and bless all": and the Society thought this sentence so important that it transferred it almost verbatim to a prominent position in its first *Report*. In the next year, 1703, the members of the Society in that most important Church centre, the University of Oxford, made the subject of a suffragan bishop to America their first consideration. The need was strongly urged by others, and in 1709 a memorial was presented by the Society to Queen Anne. Several Church dignitaries, headed by Archbishop Sharp, the Queen's guide in spiritual matters, drew up a scheme to be presented to Convocation "concerning bishops being provided for the plantations." Nothing, however, was done owing to the absence of the Bishop of London, who was supposed to be responsible for the Church in the colonies. In 1713 a second memorial was presented by the Society to Queen Anne, and was so favourably received that it was hoped the work might be set in hand at once. But the Queen's death put a stop to it.

Need of bishops.

On June 3, 1715, the Society presented an application to George I., submitting a scheme for the creation of four bishoprics—two for the Islands, two for the Continent. Of the former, one was to be settled at Barbadoes, the other at Jamaica; of the latter, one at Burlington in New Jersey, the other at Williamsbury in Virginia; and detailed suggestions were made for the incomes of the four bishops. But, alas! the Rebellion of 1715 broke out, and our statesmen could find no time for discussing such matters. Whether in any circumstances they would ever have found time is very doubtful.

The blighting influence of the Whig predominance in the Church at home extended to the Church abroad, but it is a mistake to suppose that our bishops, and still less the missionaries of the S.P.G., showed any apathy in the matter. The interest which the Archbishop of York, Dr. Sharp, manifested has already been noticed. That of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tenison, is attested by the fact that he bequeathed to the Society £1000 "towards the settlement of two bishops, one for the Continent, the other for the Islands of America"; and the terms of the bequest prove that he confidently expected the scheme to be carried out. He died in December 1715, but his successor, Archbishop Wake, took at least as strong and active an interest in the matter.

Policy of English bishops.

It may be asked, Why did not the English bishops take the matter into their own hands, fall back upon their own spiritual authority, do what by all the laws of the Church they had a perfect right to do, and take the consequences? The consequence would have been that they would have fallen under the pains of that far-reaching Act *Praemunire*. They would either have been deposed, or at least have brought about a collision between Church and State, which at that crisis was certainly to be deprecated. That such a course would have been bitterly resented by the secular power cannot be doubted. The dissenters on both sides of the water were strongly opposed to the creation of new bishoprics; and it was always the policy of Walpole, his followers, and his successors to conciliate the dissenters in every way. Perhaps surprise cannot be expressed at the opposition of dissenters when it is considered what the eighteenth-century conception of a bishop in England was. He was a great State official at least as much as a Church ruler; and as several of the colonies in North America had been founded by dissenters, it was perhaps not unnatural that they should regard with some jealousy the introduction of such officials into them. It was feared that they would be invested with powers which certainly would have interfered with the secular authority, and that the taxation of the colonies and the proposal to introduce bishops were parts of one general system inimical to political and religious liberty.

Jonathan Mayhew, a New England preacher of a violent and narrow type, was the chief opponent of the proposed establishment of episcopacy in America, and did not spare himself to prevent the possibility of the idea being carried out. To him the system of congregationalism was the only one to be tolerated. The Congregationalists had been driven out of the Old World because they had offended the bishops. Were they now to be pursued into the New World, because no other new world remained as a sanctuary from episcopal oppression? "Where," he asks, "is the Columbus to explore one for us, and pilot us to it, before we are consumed by the flames, or deluged in a flood of Episcopacy?" The Church of England, as he conceived it, was alien in her mode of worship from the simplicity of the Gospel and the apostolic times. It had been a persecuting Church in the mother country, and would become so in New England if allowed to establish itself there and to carry on an active propaganda. "What," again he asks, "might probably be the sad consequence if this growing party should once get the upper hand here, and a major vote in our houses of assembly—in which case the Church of England might become the established religion here, tests be ordained to exclude all but conformists from posts of honour and emolument, and all of us be taxed for the support of bishops and their underlings?" The dread, therefore, of Secker's proposal to establish the Episcopal Church in America must be reckoned with as one of the most powerful of the secondary causes of the Rebellion. That Secker and his friends did not grasp the political bearing of their proposals upon the already excited colonists is probable enough, and easy to understand in view of the distance from this country to America and of the imperfect facilities for communication in those days. Nor did Mayhew, on the other hand, see that episcopalians were at least entitled to the complete development of the system they professed.

But it is almost needless to say that bishops after the home pattern were not the kind of bishops that were either required or desired. Whether it be true or no, as has been said, that "the English bishops thought more of the Acts of Parliament than of the Acts of the Apostles," they certainly sought no Act of Parliament to enable them to send this

sort of functionary to the colonies. In their many utterances on the subject, extending all through the century, and bearing sincerity on the face of them, they do not breathe a hint that they wished to have anything but spiritual functions, or even to exercise them over any but willing subjects; and in some of the schemes proposed it is expressly provided that no bishop should be introduced into colonies where the dissenting element was dominant. The desires of the colonists themselves who were churchmen were equally modest and reasonable. "A plain bishop with £100 would be better than one with a coach-and-six fifty years hence." But it was of no use to represent this. The only apology, therefore, for episcopal government was the absurdly inadequate control of the Bishop of London, who lived thousands of miles away, and who had quite enough to do at home without "the care of all the churches" abroad. It adds to the absurdity, if the story be true, that it was purely by accident that the bishops of London had anything to do with the matter at all. It is said that when the first colony was founded in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, called Virginia after the Virgin Queen, the then Bishop of London happened to be a holder of Virginia stock, and therefore undertook the superintendence of the new colony. Later colonies were put under the same supervision, and the duty was passed on to the bishop's successors, each one, however, having to take out a patent for his jurisdiction, and then he appointed a commissary. To their credit be it recorded, the bishops of London in the eighteenth century recognised the moral obligation of their impossible position. No men took a greater interest in the Colonial Church, and none were more anxious to obtain for it the boon of episcopacy, than Gibson, Sherlock, Lowth, and Porteus, all bishops of London during our period.

Colonial utterances.

Among those who felt strongly the crying need of a Colonial episcopate was a distinguished member of the sister Church of Ireland, whose efforts in the cause form one of the most striking episodes in the history of the Church of the eighteenth century, and one which reflects little credit upon the secular rulers of the day. His name, it is scarcely necessary to say, was George Berkeley, an Irishman by birth and education, but an English

George Berkeley.

man by extraction, and closely connected all through his adult life with the English Church and nation. Kilkenny School, "the Eton of Ireland," and the University of Dublin had the honour of educating this most able, pure-minded, and lovable man. Having been elected successively scholar and Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and having, to the great advantage of the college, acted as tutor for several years, he was appointed Dean of Dromore in 1722, and transferred in 1724 to the deanery of Derry, said to be the noblest piece of preferment in Ireland after the episcopate, and finally became Bishop of Cloyne in 1734. His preferment was all the more creditable to the dispensers of patronage because Berkeley, as his history will show, was the very reverse of a self-seeking man, and it was not therefore given on the principle on which the Unjust Judge attended to the importunate widow; and because he was in some respects out of harmony with the spirit of his age.

Berkeley a Platonist.

All men, it is said, are born either Aristotelians or Platonists, that is, all have a leaning either to the hard reasoning, prosaic view of things, or to the soft, emotional view; or, as it might otherwise be stated, either to the logical or the intuitive method. Now in the eighteenth century the tendency was undoubtedly Aristotelian. Berkeley's was essentially Platonic, not only because he was an admirer of Plato, and adopted to a very great extent Plato's theory of Ideas, but also because his whole tone of mind was of the Platonic cast. He had stated his views, at least in embryo, before he was preferred, and they formed no bar to his preferment. Moreover, he had preached a sermon in 1712 in the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, on the delicate subject of passive obedience, which not unnaturally caused him to be suspected of a leaning towards Jacobitism. The sermon was published and created a sensation, passing through three editions within a year. This was not likely to commend him to the Hanoverian government which speedily succeeded. Berkeley, however, was not much interested in politics, and did not become, like William Law, whom in some respects he resembled, a Non-Juror of the second generation.

In would be foreign to the present purpose to enter minutely into his philosophical speculations, and worse than

useless to treat them superficially. Let it suffice to say, as bearing upon our subject, that they were propounded on practical and religious grounds. As a pious man, he was troubled by the advance of materialism, and he determined, as it were, to pursue the enemy into his own country, and show that materialism was philosophically, as well as morally and religiously unsound. Hence his theory of Idealism, which found expression in his *Treatise concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge.* The first Part appeared as early as 1710, and in it he showed that, in his own beautiful language, "all the choir of heaven and furniture of earth, all those bodies which compose the mighty poems of the world, have not any substance without a mind." His ingenuity and intellectual powers were admired, but his Ideal theory was merely ridiculed and completely misunderstood by many both of his contemporaries and in later times. His doctrine was not, however, confuted either by Dr. Johnson kicking a stone to show that matter really existed, or by the well-known play upon the word "matter," or by other more serious antagonists. He is now better appreciated as a great philosopher as well as a man of singularly noble character, to which all his contemporaries did justice, even those who most disagreed with him. Berkeley has found in our day an admirable biographer, editor, and expounder of his views in Professor Fraser, whose own studies and style render him peculiarly competent for the life-task so nobly undertaken.

Theory of Matter.

There were other reasons besides his handsome preferment which would tend to make Berkeley unwilling to bid farewell to both Ireland and England. In 1713 he obtained a short leave of absence from his college to visit England —first, on the ground of health; secondly, to see through the press a new work, *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, which dealt with the same subject, the phenomenal nature of the things of sense; and, thirdly, "to make acquaintance with men of merit rather than to engage the interests of those in power." He was speedily admitted into the circle of wits, which then contained a brilliant galaxy of talent, including Swift, Steele, Addison, Pope, Clarke, Arbuthnot, and Atterbury. The first two were his own countrymen. Swift, although the two

Visit to London.

men were about as different in almost all respects as two human beings could be, treated him kindly. Steele warmly welcomed him as a colleague in the new periodical, *The Guardian*, in which he wrote several papers, chiefly against the Freethinkers, whom he disliked as much as Steele did, but with more knowledge of the subject, which is, after all, not saying much. Had he not had higher objects in view, Berkeley might certainly have taken high rank among the great wits of the day. But, on his again visiting England in 1720, when the excitement about the South Sea Scheme was at its height, he was shocked, as so good a man might well be, at the luxury, the grossness, the corruption which he saw prevalent. So in 1721 he published an *Essay towards preventing the Ruin of Great Britain*, which he feared was impending from these causes.

Berkeley's gloomy view of home prospects must be connected with the project which he soon afterwards conceived of setting on foot a new state of things, more in accordance with his ideal, in distant lands. This gives him a prominent place in any sketch of the colonial and mission work of the period. Curiously enough, his own home prospects seemed to brighten in the interval. His position at Trinity College, Dublin, was an honourable and useful, but not a very lucrative one. But an increase of income came from more sources than one. Through the influence of his friend Lord Perceval, subsequently the Earl of Egmont, he was appointed Dean of Dromore. This appointment, however, involved him in a lawsuit, because the bishop of the diocese claimed the nomination. Berkeley entered into it with characteristic eagerness, not because he was covetous, but because he feared the loss of it might affect his darling Bermuda scheme. "After much weary litigation," he writes on September 19, 1723, "as for the Deanery of Dromore, I despair of seeing it end to my advantage. The truth is, my fixed purpose of going to Bermuda sets me above soliciting anything with earnestness in this part of the world. It can be of no use to me, but as it may enable me the better to prosecute that design; and it must be owned that the present possession of something in the Church would make my application for an establishment in those islands more considered. I mean, the

charter for a College there; which of all things I desire, as being what would reconcile duty and inclination, making my life at once more useful to the public, and more agreeable to myself, than I can possibly expect elsewhere."

On May 23, 1723, the unhappy "Vanessa," Esther Vanhomrigh, whom his friend Swift had treated so ill, died of a broken heart. She had revoked the bequest of her fortune to her faithless lover, and left it to be divided between Berkeley and a Mr. Marshall, an Irish judge. The legacy came as a complete surprise to Berkeley, as he had never exchanged a word with the lady during the whole course of his life. The sum left to him amounted to about £3000, and this gave him new enthusiasm and hope for his Bermuda scheme, since it made many things in his private affairs easier. He proposed to take up his abode permanently in Bermuda, and to associate with himself some half-dozen of the most ingenious and agreeable men of his college. He had already secured about a dozen Englishmen who had determined to live in the West Indies. His project included the reformation of the manners of the English in the plantations, and the method he proposed to adopt was the propagation of the Gospel among the American savages, and the founding of a college or seminary for the education of English young men as clergymen, as well as for the training of a number of young American savages until they had taken the degree of Master of Arts. Berkeley was fully alive to the necessity of a native ministry. He wished the college so to train them that, being "well instructed in the Christian religion, practical mathematics, and other liberal arts and sciences, and early imbued with public-spirited principles and inclinations, they may become the fittest instruments for spreading religion, morals, and civil life among their countrymen, who can entertain no suspicion or jealousy of men of their own blood and language, as they might do of English missionaries, who can never be well qualified for that work."

Vanessa and Berkeley.

This has been called a romantic scheme, and so it was. Everything that Berkeley did was in a sense romantic, but it was also an essentially practical scheme, in fact, more practical than was at all common in those days. Berkeley, it will be

seen, hit upon a point now universally recognised as essential to the success of mission work, but then by no means universally recognised, and that is, that training of a native agency which would turn an exotic into a plant indigenous to the soil. Next in importance to the appointment of bishops, a matter on which Berkeley strongly insists, was the foundation of a college for the training of clergy and other workers. Indeed, the two things were closely connected, for the American missionaries to be trained in his college were "to receive holy orders in England" only "till such time as episcopacy was established in these parts." It was not altogether an original scheme. Something of the sort had been introduced by the Codrington College at Barbadoes, which, however, had not up to that time proved a success. A year after the Vanessa legacy, in May 1724, through the intervention of Lady Perceval, his ever kind friend's like-minded wife, he was appointed to the richer deanery of Derry, upon which he writes: "Yesterday I received my patent for the best deanery in the kingdom, that of Derry. It is said to be worth £1500 per annum; but as I do not consider it with a view to enriching myself, so I shall be perfectly contented if it facilitates and recommends my scheme of Bermuda, which I am in hopes will meet with a better reception if it comes from one possessed of so great a deanery. I may chance not to be twopence richer for the preferment; for by the time I have paid for the house and first-fruits, I hope I shall have brought the Bermuda project to an issue, which, God willing, is to be my employment next winter in London."

Dean of Derry.

He promptly carried out his intention, for in September 1724 we find him in London armed with a letter from Swift to Lord Carteret, who was coming to Ireland as the Lord-Lieutenant. The letter has often been quoted, but it is so characteristic both of the writer and the subject that it must be quoted yet once more:—

"There is a gentleman of this kingdom just gone for England. It is Dr. George Berkeley, Dean of Derry, the best preferment amongst us, being worth £1100 a year. He was a Fellow of the University here; and going to England very young, about thirteen years ago, the bearer of this became

founder of a sect called the Immaterialists, by the force of a very curious book upon that subject. Dr. Smalridge and many other eminent persons were his proselytes. I sent him secretary and chaplain to Sicily with my Lord Peterborough; and upon his lordship's return, Dr. Berkeley spent above seven years in travelling over most parts of Europe, but chiefly through every corner of Italy, Sicily, and other Islands. When he came back to England, he found so many friends that he was effectually recommended to the Duke of Grafton, by whom he was lately made Dean of Derry. I am now to mention his errand. He is an absolute philosopher with regard to money, titles, and power; and for three years past has been struck with a notion of founding a university at Bermudas, by a charter from the Crown. He has seduced several of the hopefullest young clergymen and others here, many of them well provided for, and all in the fairest way for preferment; but in England his conquests are greater, and I doubt will spread very far this winter. He showed me a little tract which he designs to publish, and there your Excellency will see his whole scheme of a life academico-philosophical (I shall make you remember what you were), of a college founded for Indian scholars and missionaries; where he most exorbitantly proposes a whole £100 a year for himself, £50 for a fellow, and £10 for a student. His heart will break if his deanery be not taken from him, and left to your Excellency's disposal. I discouraged him by the coldness of Courts and Ministers, who will interpret all this as impossible and a vision; but nothing will do. And therefore I do humbly entreat your Excellency, either to use such persuasions as will keep one of the first men in the kingdom for learning and virtue quiet at home, or assist him by your credit to compass his romantic design; which, however, is very noble and generous, and directly proper for a great person of your excellent education to encourage."

Nothing is more striking about Berkeley than his extraordinary power of persuasion. He had already prevailed upon three of his brother fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, William Thompson, Jonathan Rogers, and Thomas King, men who, as Swift says, were "well provided for and in the fairest way for preferment," to sacrifice their positions and

accompany him, with the not very inviting prospect of being fellows with the modest income of £50 a year of a college still *in nubibus*. And he went to London to exercise these powers on still more difficult subjects, for never was there a time more unpropitious for such an application as Berkeley came to make. The South Sea Bubble had lately burst. Men were naturally suspicious of adventures in foreign lands, and of all adventures most of those which were of a religious nature. For Walpole's policy of "let alone" was at its height. Men's thoughts were "of the earth, earthy." They were especially disinclined to help the Church for fear of offending dissenters. And yet Berkeley's fascinating personality was triumphant over all these obstacles. He found his way not only to the hearts but, what was more difficult, to the purses of all sorts of unlikely people, and speedily collected £5000 for his scheme. The largest sum, £500, was, as might be expected, from Lady Betty Hastings, who was ever foremost in all good works, and, amazing to relate, Sir Robert Walpole was induced to put his name down for £200. Berkeley met the members of the Scriblerus Club, who ridiculed the plan and raised all sorts of objections; but when he craved and obtained leave to reply, he "displayed his plan with such an astonishing and amazing force of eloquence and enthusiasm that they were struck dumb, and, after some pause, rose all up together, with earnestness exclaiming, 'Let us set out with him immediately.'" So says Warton, in his *Essay on Pope*.

Attempt to found his College.

He then set about the still harder task of winning over Parliament to his side and obtaining a grant from Government. There was money which might appropriately be devoted to the purpose. By the Treaty of Utrecht £80,000 had been given to England as the purchase-money of St. Christopher, or, as it was commonly called, St. Kitts. It had at one time been intended by Queen Anne to employ this sum for the endowment of four bishoprics in America. What Berkeley desired was a quarter of this sum to be granted, with a royal charter for the foundation of his College. He canvassed every member of Parliament, and so successfully that on May 11, 1726, the House, with only two dissentients, voted an address to the Crown to make the grant. The charter

specified all details. It authorised the erection of a college in the Bermudas, to be called the College of St. Paul, and to be governed by a president and nine fellows, who were constituted a body corporate with all the usual privileges. Berkeley was named as the first president, and three fellows of Trinity College the first fellows. They were given permission to retain their home preferments until they had been eighteen months in the Islands. They were to elect six more fellows within two years, and all future vacancies were to be filled by co-optation, with a power reserved to the Bishop of London as visitor to nominate successors in case of a year's lapse of duty on the part of the survivors. The charge for education in the college was to be limited to £10 a year for each scholar, and was to include the cost of clothes, board, and lodging. The power to grant degrees was conferred on the college, and a secretary of State was appointed chancellor. The College charter.

But Berkeley had still a long time to wait. He had to remain in London nearly four years, and used to attend the philosophical conversations held by Caroline, both when she was Princess of Wales and when she became Queen Consort, not, he says, because he loved the Court, but because he loved America. His business was delayed by the death of the King on June 14, 1727. At last the Broad Seal was put to the warrant for his grant, and on September 6, 1728, Berkeley, with the distinct understanding from the King, Walpole, and Parliament that the grant was to be paid, sailed for Rhode Island, purposing to stay there awhile until matters could be arranged in Bermuda. But Bermuda he never saw. He waited and waited on in Rhode Island for the fulfilment of the promise of the Government. He was not idle in his beautiful island home. He wrote there one of his best-known works, *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher*, which takes rank among the many able works written in answer to the Deists, and has already been noticed in connexion with that controversy. *Alciphron.*

He began to think that Rhode Island was more suited to his purposes, but he had not a free hand. He describes his situation in touching terms to his friend, Lord Perceval —first in the June after he landed: "The truth is, I am

not in my own power, not being at liberty to act without the concurrence as well of the Ministry as of my associates. I cannot, therefore, place the college where I please; and though on some accounts I did, and do still, think it would more probably be attended with success if placed here rather than in Bermuda, yet if the Government and those engaged with me should persist in the old scheme, I am ready to go thither, and will do so as soon as I hear the money is received and my associates arrived. Before I left England I was reduced to a difficult situation. Had I continued there, the report would have obtained (which I found beginning to spread) that I had dropped the design, after it had cost me and my friends so much trouble and expense. On the other hand, if I had taken leave of my friends, even those who assisted and approved my undertaking would have condemned my living abroad before the King's bounty was received. This obliged me to come away in the private manner that I did, and to run the risk of a tedious winter voyage. Nothing else could have convinced the world that I was in earnest." And a year later in March 1733: "I wait here with all the anxiety that attends suspense, until I know what I can depend upon, and what course I am to take. I must own the disappointments I have met with have really touched me, not without much affecting my health and spirits. If the founding of a college for the spread of religion and learning in America had been a foolish project, it cannot be supposed the Court, the Ministers, and the Parliament would have given such encouragement to it; and if, after that encouragement, they also engaged to endow and protect it lest it drop, the disappointment indeed may be to me, but the censure, I think, will light elsewhere."

The fear intimated in the last sentence was only too well founded. Walpole was a wary man, and he knew that the time when the glamour of Berkeley's personality was influencing men's minds was not the time to oppose him; but all along he never meant that the project should be carried out; and when at last, in 1730, Bishop Gibson, who was the proper person to do so, both from his known interest in mission work and also from his official connexion as Bishop of

London with the Church in the colonies, asked what the real intention of the Government was, he received the heartless reply: "If you put the question to me as a Minister, I must and can assure you that the money shall most undoubtedly be paid, as soon as suits with public convenience; but if you ask me as a friend, whether Dean Berkeley should continue in America, expecting the payment of £20,000, I advise him by all means to return to Europe, and to give up his present expectations." Disappointment.

The answer was made known to Berkeley by his friend Perceval, and of course there was nothing for him to do but to return home a disappointed man. So in the autumn of 1731 he bade farewell to America for ever, and perhaps as a sort of *solatium* was made Bishop of Cloyne in 1734. But he still took a deep interest in America. He had made acquaintance in Rhode Island with one of the ablest of the S.P.G. missionaries, Samuel Johnson, of whom more will be heard presently, and Johnson persuaded him to give to Yale college nearly a thousand volumes of theological works, which was, it is said, "the first collection of books that ever came at one time to America." Berkeley also made over to the same college, "for the encouragement of classical learning," the farm of ninety-six acres which he had bought on Rhode Island. After scrupulously returning all the subscriptions he had received from his friends, he found that £200 remained unclaimed, and made it over to the S.P.G. In 1732 he preached the anniversary sermon of the Society, and it is no derogation to other preachers to say that it is one of the most valuable of the whole set. Not only was it, like all Berkeley's compositions, admirably written, but, unlike some others, Berkeley could "speak that he did know, and testify that he had seen." And he bears in it unimpeachable testimony to the high character and efficiency of the Society's missionaries whose work he had known. Such testimony was of double weight coming from such a man. Perhaps it may be thought that too much space has been devoted to this sad incident, which led to no direct results; but it is so interesting in itself, and also affords so painful an instance of the way in which the Church, through no fault of its own, was thwarted in its work abroad, that it seemed worth telling at some length.

We necessarily connect the attempt of Berkeley with that of Oglethorpe, which in one sense was more successful.

Oglethorpe.

Berkeley and Oglethorpe had been friends ever since 1713, when Berkeley was appointed chaplain and secretary to the Earl of Peterborough on his embassy to Sicily, on which occasion Oglethorpe was an official in Peterborough's suite. Half of the grant promised to Berkeley was applied, at the instance of Oglethorpe, to the new colony of Georgia, which, for purely benevolent motives, was established by him. It should be added, however, that Oglethorpe would not touch the grant until he had clearly ascertained from Berkeley himself that the Bermuda scheme was abandoned. No doubt the reason why what was denied to Berkeley was, in part, given to Oglethorpe was that Oglethorpe's project, though originated for philanthropic and religious ends, had a political importance. The new colony, by occupying vacant territory between the rivers Alatamaha and Savannah, would seem to protect the southern border of Carolina from attacks of the Spaniards in Florida and of the French on the Mississippi; and Oglethorpe, as an experienced and distinguished soldier, would be the right man in the right place from this point of view, one from which the Ministers of George II. would be far more inclined to regard it than from that of religion or charity.

Oglethorpe, however, was more than the mere soldier. He was a member of the College of Corpus Christi, Oxford, and Dr. Fowler, in his very interesting *History* of the college, describes him as "one of the most remarkable men Corpus has ever produced." He waged war not only against the foreign enemies of his country, but against the iniquitous abuses which prevailed in debtors' prisons in England, to which his attention was called by the sad death of a friend through ill-usage in the Fleet prison. In 1728 he brought the matter before Parliament, secured the appointment of a committee, with himself as chairman, to inquire into the state of the prisons; and the disclosures which were made through his investigations in this capacity led him to think of founding his new colony as a place of refuge for the poor wretches whom he resolved to help. The colony was also intended for missionary purposes; for its

founder hoped that the Gospel would thence spread to the surrounding Indians. He obtained a Royal Charter in 1732 for founding the colony, called Georgia in honour of the King, and personally conducted the first band of 114 settlers thither in the autumn of the same year. He was largely helped by private charity as well as by public grant. Arrived at his destination, he not only established his settlers, beginning to build what was afterwards the town of Savannah, but held friendly conference with the leaders of the tribes of the Indians; and he brought the chief of one tribe, Tomo-chi-chi, with his wife, back with him to England, where they were very graciously received.

The colony seemed to thrive, and other towns were built. English, Scottish, and German settlers were added to the population, as well as a body of emigrants from Salzburg, who had been driven from their home for their religion, and were most liberally aided in their distress both by the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. Among others who were deeply interested in the success of Oglethorpe's scheme was Samuel Wesley, Rector of Epworth, who, "while crowds of nobility and gentry were pouring in their congratulations, begged to offer his poor mite of thanks." Within a few months the good rector died, but his death did not end the connexion of the name of Wesley with Georgia, but drew it much closer. John Wesley went to London to present his father's latest work, *Dissertations on Job*, to Queen Caroline, and to gather in the subscriptions to it which had been promised, and were now much needed for the widow and family. Oglethorpe was one of the largest subscribers, and had ever been a good friend of the Wesley family, and as he was then seeking for men who would help in the spiritual work in Georgia, which he had much at heart, he gladly accepted the recommendation of Dr. Burton, one of the Georgia trustees, who had watched with kindly interest the work of the Oxford Methodists, and took back with him the two brothers—John as a S.P.G. missionary, with the modest stipend of £50 a year; and Charles, who had just been ordained, as his secretary. Benjamin Ingham, another Oxford Methodist, and Charles Delamotte, an attached pupil of Wesley, also joined the

Wesley and the S.P.G.

expedition. John Wesley's main attraction to the work was that it would enable him to preach the Gospel to the Indians; and he was bitterly disappointed when he found that, instead of being a missionary to the heathen, he was, in reality, nothing more than a parish priest to a set of people who were no more congenial to him than those of Epworth. "I came out to convert the Indians," he says. And again: "I openly declared both before and ever since my coming hither, that I neither could nor would take charge of the English any longer than till I could go among the Indians."

Charles Wesley was not happier at Frederika than John was at Savannah, and had the additional disadvantage of not being on comfortable terms with Oglethorpe. That some part of their conduct, notably that of John, was injudicious, cannot reasonably be denied; but it is surely a mistake to regard their mission to Georgia as a failure, though undoubtedly John's own account of it in his *Journal* would lead to that conclusion. But it must be remembered that that *Journal* was written by an impulsive young man smarting under a bitter disappointment. His own later notes upon more than one passage in it show that it must not be taken literally. John Wesley undoubtedly made his mark in Georgia, as all truly earnest men do make their mark wherever they go. His successor, George Whitefield, writes with no less generosity than truth: "The good Mr. John Wesley has done in America is inexpressible. His name is very precious among the people, and has laid a foundation that I hope neither man nor devils will ever be able to shake. Oh that I may follow him as he has followed Christ!"

It would perhaps have been better if Whitefield had followed Wesley a little more closely than he did; for, considering that Whitefield was an ordained priest of the Church of England, and that he went out distinctly in that capacity (for Oglethorpe was a very ardent and attached churchman), it cannot be said that his career in America was what it ought to have been. He was ordained deacon on June 20, 1736, by Bishop Benson at Gloucester, and preached his first sermon in St. Mary-de-Crypt on June 27. At first he was not only earnest and diligent, but regular, conducting his work on proper

George Whitefield.

Church lines, and winning the confidence both of the people and the trustees, who, at the request of the parishioners, entrusted Savannah to his charge, and granted him five hundred acres of land for his projected orphan-house. He had, of course, to go to England to receive priest's orders. These were conferred on him at Christ Church, Oxford, on January 14, 1739, again by Bishop Benson, acting for Dr. Secker. He was ordained by letters dimissory from Bishop Gibson of London, who accepted as his title Whitefield's appointment by the Georgia Trustees as incumbent of Savannah. It was during his brief sojourn in England that he began that marvellous preaching career which subsequently he pursued for so long. In 1740 he returned to America and began the same course there. If he had been an unattached evangelist, bound by no oath of canonical obedience and tied to no particular spot, we could have admired with less qualification his disinterested zeal and his burning eloquence, which undoubtedly stirred up the spiritual consciousness of many who before lived careless and ungodly lives. But he set all the laws of his Church at defiance; paid no regard whatever to the admonition of the Bishop of London's commissary, who had the nearest approach to episcopal authority which poor America then possessed, and compared him to Alexander the coppersmith who did the Apostle much harm, and excited the hostility of the clergy more speedily and bitterly in America than he did in England, as was natural in a country where the Church was weak and in the midst of foes. In short, he became practically a dissenting minister instead of a parish priest.

The great names of Berkeley, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and Oglethorpe make their efforts in missionary and colonial work more noticeable than those of others who are not so well known; but if we judge by results, the labours of some less known men deserve greater prominence than theirs. So far as the American colonies were concerned, and these were by far the largest and most important spheres, the best results appeared in a quarter where they might have least been expected. We might have expected them in Virginia, for it was essentially a Church colony. Originally "it was simply a little English parish, bringing its minister, its Prayer Book, its

customs, and its thoughts, to set them down in the midst of an unoccupied land." But the Church never really throve there. Or we might have expected them in Maryland, where the real founder of the great Missionary Society, which practically took the lion's share of the work in the colonies, and in which he ever took the deepest interest, Dr. Bray, was commissary; where, though the colony was originally a Roman Catholic one, the Church of England soon became the dominating religious influence. There too the nearest approach was made to the appointment of a bishop in 1730. The clergy had actually selected their man, one Colebatch, and the Bishop of London, Dr. Gibson, had promised to consecrate him as Suffragan if he came to England for the purpose; but the colonial legislature issued a *ne exeat*, and forbade him to leave the province. But the last place we should have selected would have been New England, the home of dissenters, in the whole of which in 1680 there was only one Episcopalian clergyman; the last part of New England, Connecticut, and the last spot in Connecticut, Yale College, the stronghold of the Independents.

New England, Connecticut.

The story is a curious one. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, a Mr. Smithson gave a Prayer Book to a young graduate of Harvard College named Timothy Cutler who was a candidate for the Presbyterian ministry. Before 1720, Cutler had risen to be the honoured President of Yale College. He had read his Prayer Book carefully, and gathered round him a little knot of men, including Johnson and Brown, two of the leading tutors, who studied the nature and organisation of the Church, and particularly the question of holy orders. Their college library supplied them with the works of the best English theologians, and having studied these carefully, they came to the conclusion that their own orders were defective, and that they must have recourse to an Apostolic Church, as the Church of England is, for a valid commission. On September 13, 1722, the President called the Trustees of the college together and told them that he and his friends were not satisfied with Presbyterian ordination, and must seek orders in the Church of England. Debates arose which need

Cutler of Yale.

not here be noticed. The upshot was that three of the number, Cutler, Johnson, and Brown, proceeded to England. Brown died of small-pox, but the other two were ordained, were accepted as missionaries of the S.P.G., and became the two most valuable accessions which the Church of England in America ever gained. Cutler became rector of a parish in Boston, Johnson of Stratford in Connecticut for fifty years, and these two were the advanced guard of a host of men of similar thought who have entered the Church since their time from the same motives.

In New England, and especially in Connecticut, a noble type of churchmen arose, who formed the backbone of the system; and there at last the seeds sown by the great Dean Berkeley sprang up and bore fruit. For when Berkeley returned to England, he left behind him his library, which was rich in the writings of the best divines of the Church, and to this bequest may be traced the furtherance of the study of solid learning, and of the pursuit of sound religion, which characterised, for example, the life of Pennsylvania University and of Columbia College for so many generations. Persecution had its usual effect in attaching still more closely to the Church these churchmen by conviction in a Presbyterian centre. The want of bishops put them at a cruel disadvantage to the dominant sect, who had all the apparatus they required for the carrying out of their principles, which the Church had not. They represented this so forcibly and plainly to the home authorities that their own words are worth quoting.

"It were too long and tragical," writes a New England clergyman, "to repeat the several difficulties and severities and affronts which our hearers are harassed with in many parts of this colony, by vigorous persecutions and arbitrary pecuniary demands, inflicted on the conscientious members of our Church by domineering Presbyterians, the old implacable enemies of our Sion's prosperity. Here your sons are imprisoned, arrested, and nonsuited with prodigious cost, contrary to the laws of God and man. All professors of the Church of England, over whom there is not a particular missionary appointed, are obliged to support Presbyterian teachers and their meeting-houses—a cruelty, injustice, and usurpation imposed on no other society."

"The Independents, or Congregationalists," they complain, "here in New England, especially in Massachusetts and Connecticut, without any regard to the King's supremacy, have established themselves by law, and so are pleased to consider and treat us of the Church as dissenters. . . . The Presbyterians chiefly obtain in the south-western colonies, especially in those of New York, Jersey, and Pennsylvania, where they have flourishing presbyteries and synods in full vigour; while the poor Church of England in all these colonies is in a low, depressed, and very imperfect state, for want of her pure primitive episcopal form of Church government. . . . We cannot but think ourselves extremely injured, and in a state little short of persecution, while our candidates are forced, at a great expense both of lives and fortunes, to go a thousand leagues for every ordination, and we are destitute of confirmation and a regular government. So that, unless we can have bishops, especially at this juncture, the Church, and with it the interest of true religion, must dwindle and greatly decay, while we suffer the contempt and triumph of our neighbours, who even plume themselves with the hopes (as from the lukewarmness and indifference of this miserably apostatising age I doubt they have too much occasion to do) that the episcopate is more likely to be abolished at home than established abroad; and indeed, they are vain enough to think that the civil government at home is itself really better affected to them than to the Church, and even disaffected to that; otherwise, say they, it would doubtless establish episcopacy."

Samuel Johnson's testimony.

And the good Samuel Johnson, writing from Stratford, Connecticut, to the Bishop of London in 1724, says: "The fountain of all our misery is the want of a bishop, for whom there are many thousands of souls in this country who do impatiently long and pray, and for want do extremely suffer." He adds: "that there is not one Jacobite or disaffected person in this colony, nor above two or three, that I know of, in America. But, for want of a loyal and orthodox bishop to inspect us, we lie open to be misled into the wretched maxims of that abandoned set of men, as well as a great many other perverse principles." These complaints more adequately express the position of the episcopal Church than any summary of them could do.

A bare notice only can be given here of John Beach, like Cutler and Johnson, a distinguished member of Yale College, who was drawn to the Church by conviction, and received holy orders in England. He was accepted as a missionary by the S.P.G., and laboured most successfully at Newtown and Reading in Connecticut, the members of the Church of England in his district increasing twentyfold, and his ministry in the Church extending to fifty years. Henry Caner passed through exactly the same experience; for twenty years he was equally successful at Fairfield, and then for twenty-eight years more at Boston as Rector of King's Chapel. Then the War of Independence drove him to England. He took with him the vestments, registers, and plate belonging to his church, and he died at Long Ashton, Somerset, in 1792, at the age of ninety-two. Samuel Seabury, too, a Congregationalist minister, became a churchman, and was for thirty years an earnest and very successful missionary of the S.P.G. in various places. To him a special interest attaches as father of a still more famous Samuel Seabury, the first bishop of the American Church, who was trained by his father in the way that he should go. Of these more might well be said, but we must pass on to the work of the Church in other foreign parts.

Newfoundland had been connected with England ever since Sir Humphrey Gilbert took possession of St. John's and the neighbouring country, to the extent of two hundred leagues, in 1583, in the name of Queen Elizabeth, with the full consent of the islanders. He then proclaimed three laws to be put in force immediately: the first for religion, "which in publique exercise should be according to the Church of England." But the old proverb was reversed. This good beginning made a bad ending. It was mockery to talk of the "publique exercise of religion" according to the Church of England when no provision was made for that exercise. Newfoundland was shamefully neglected until at the beginning of the eighteenth century the good Dr. Bray took the matter in hand. Then first the S.P.C.K. and next the S.P.G. supplied to the best of their ability the spiritual wants of the colonists in that wild and far-off region, and prepared the way for the noble work done under the guidance of Bishop Feild in our own day.

Newfoundland.

From Newfoundland, with its poor fishermen, sailors, and Indian natives, we pass far south to a set of islands widely different in climate, in productiveness, and in population, the West Indies. Church work had not been so utterly neglected there as in Newfoundland. Churches had been built and congregations gathered in most of the islands, but it would appear nevertheless that the Church had a more encouraging field in the dreary North than in the luxurious South. The two classes which formed the staple population in the South were not of a kind to welcome Church ordinances. The planters who were the masters were mainly intent on making money, and the negro slaves were more likely to be touched by the emotional religion of the Methodists than by the sober system of the Church. The first event to be noticed in connexion with Church work in this quarter is the foundation of Codrington College in Barbadoes. Christopher Codrington, like his father, had been born in Barbadoes, and died there in 1710, bequeathing his estates in that island in trust to the S.P.G. for the foundation of the college which bears his name. It was designed for "a convenient number of Professors and Scholars to study and practise Physick and Chirurgery, as well as Divinity, that by the apparent usefulness of the former to all mankind, they might both endear themselves to the people, and have the better opportunity of doing good to men's souls, while they are taking care of their bodies." So that this distinguished officer seems to have anticipated the plan of medical missions which are now universally recognised as a most invaluable aid to Christian work in foreign parts. Difficulties arose, and the building of the college was not completed till 1743. Soon after its completion a grammar school was opened "with twelve scholars for the foundation," and prospered for a while. Then all the buildings were blown down in a tempest, and the planters do not seem to have cared to have them set up again. But the college was at last restored, mainly through the efforts and liberality of an inhabitant of the island, John Brathwaite, towards the end of the century, and it has since done excellent work.

West Indies.

Codrington College, Barbadoes.

The name of Codrington is also connected with Antigua as well as Barbadoes, the two Codringtons, father and son,

having been its governors. Unfortunately, the younger Codrington was succeeded by a governor of a very different type, who was a great hindrance instead of a help to Church work, among other ways by introducing bad clergy into the island. But here, as in the other islands, Bishop Gibson, though thousands of miles away, rendered good service during his incumbency of the see of London from 1723 to 1748 by appointing excellent commissaries to act in his name, by correspondence with the governors, and by issuing searching inquiries to the clergy, in the answers to which he took the greatest interest. Antigua.

In Jamaica the Church prospered more than in most of the West India islands in British possession during the eighteenth century. There were already fifteen parishes in the island and four more were added during the century, which indicates progress. It is connected with the honoured name of Selwyn, the ancestor of the greatest missionary bishop of modern times, Major-General William Selwyn having for a very brief time been the governor, and being buried there. But in this, the most important of all the islands, disputes arose about the extent of the powers of the Bishop of London and of the House of Assembly in Church matters, which were a sad hindrance to Church work. Jamaica.

From the very earliest establishment of English colonies in America the duty of extending the blessings of Christianity to the native races had not only been recognised, but declared in various authoritative documents to be one of the chief objects of establishing the colony. It cannot be said that this avowed object was adequately carried out or even attempted. The white man and the red man were more often brought together in a hostile than in an amicable relation. The "noble savage," as he used to be called, had many qualities which rendered it peculiarly difficult to ascertain whether any really permanent impression was made upon him. He was greatly under the influence of his own superstitious guides, and every step taken in the direction of Christianity was a step taken in the direction of undermining the power of these guides, who were bitterly opposed to conversions. Moreover, he had too often been cruelly used by the white man who came to occupy his land, The Indians.

and had only too many and too good reasons to dislike and distrust him. But the obligation of the Christian settlers to proclaim the Gospel to the Indian tribes among which they had settled was not ignored during the period with which this volume deals. The beginning of the Georgian era saw two laudable schemes for the purpose apparently flourishing. In Virginia Colonel Spotswood, who had been governor of the colony since 1710, won the hearts of the Indian natives by educating their children in a school which he established and maintained, where the scholars learnt to read, and to pray in the name of Christ, and were instructed in the rudiments of the Christian faith. In 1718 a grant of £1000 was made by the authorities of William and Mary's College at Henrico for its benefit, but the school was soon afterwards broken up.

In the closing years of the reign of Queen Anne, after the famous visit of the four Sachems to England, immortalised in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*, two missionaries were promised by the S.P.G. at a stipend of £150 each (an unusually large one), with an interpreter and a schoolmaster to work among the Mohawks, in response to the suggestion of the Sachems: "If your great Queen will be pleased to send us some persons to instruct us they shall find a most hearty welcome." Towards the close of 1712 the mission went forth, headed by a competent missionary, Andrews, who was met at Albany by the Sachems with great demonstrations of joy. The Indians came in numbers to hear his preaching, and readily sent their children to his school. But difficulties arose. The parents would not have their children taught English. The Mohawks did not really mean to give up their heathen habits, and in 1718 poor Andrews had to request the S.P.G. to allow him to retire. Another effort was made under the able conduct of Henry Barclay, a missionary of the S.P.G. at Albany. He worked diligently among the Indians, and so did John Miln, who succeeded him in 1727, and had Barclay's son as Catechist. This work went on for several years and was very successful, especially when, in 1737, the younger Barclay became head of the mission. The Indians received his instructions, attended public worship, and gave up many of their evil habits, and in 1743 only two or

three out of the whole tribe remained unbaptized. In 1748 Ogilvie, a Yale College man, succeeded, and conducted the mission with equal success, and it is remarkable that when the war broke out, the Mohawks alone of all the Indian tribes remained steadfast to the English, to whose missionaries they owed so much. Ogilvie was nobly supported by Sir William Johnson, who took a life-long interest in the Indian tribes, and was in 1756 appointed Superintendent of Indian affairs. Two other missionaries of the S.P.G., notably John Stuart, who translated the Gospel of St. Mark into the Mohawk tongue, and Charles Inglis, afterwards the first bishop of Nova Scotia, were active and successful workers in the same field.

Good men in the Church at home also showed great interest in the conversion of the Indians. The saintly Bishop Wilson published in 1740 an *Essay towards the Instruction of the Indians* in the form of a dialogue between an Indian and a missionary, which had originated in a conversation held with his friend Oglethorpe respecting the Indians in Georgia. It has already been seen that the evangelisation of the Indians was part of Oglethorpe's design in founding the colony, and that the thought that he was going to preach the Gospel to the Indians was the chief reason why John Wesley accepted Oglethorpe's invitation. But the Indians in Georgia were not so open to impressions as those in Albany, and the work fell through.

The Negroes.

Of course the Indian and the negro differed as widely as possible. They were of different races, different habits, different position, and required a totally different treatment. But as both belong to alien and oppressed races, it is not surprising to find that the same good people who were interested in the spiritual welfare of the one were interested also in that of the other, and so the recurrence of familiar names must be expected in this section of our work. The subject must be treated apart from that of the slave trade or even of slavery. For the whole of the eighteenth century negro slaves existed as a fact in the British colonies and States of North America and in the West Indies. From the very first the S.P.G. recognised it as its distinct duty to care for the souls of the black men as well as

for those of the red and the white men. Thus Dean Berkeley joins the two subjects in his famous *Proposal* for his college in Bermuda. Having spoken of "the small care that had been taken to convert the negroes of our plantations, who, to the infamy of England and scandal of the world, continue heathen under Christian masters and in Christian countries," he goes on in support of his scheme for a native ministry to declare that "the most zealous and able missionary from England must find himself but ill qualified for converting the American heathen, if we consider the difference of language, the wild way of living, and above all the great jealousy and prejudice which savage natives have towards foreigners, or innovations introduced by them."

Samuel Johnson and others were as active in working among the negroes as they were among the Indians. The Indians had at least one advantage over the negroes. They were their own masters, and could always listen to the message of the Gospel if they would. But the negroes were not, and their masters were not always willing that they should be baptized. A ridiculous notion prevailed that when a negro was baptized he became free; and the time occupied in their instruction was grudged by masters who regarded them simply as chattels. Bishop Gibson, who, as has already been seen, thoroughly appreciated his responsibility for the colonies, wrote two public letters in 1727 which produced a considerable effect. One addressed to the masters and mistresses of families in our plantations, "to encourage and promote the instruction of their negroes in the Christian faith," insisted upon the obligations which bound them "to that pious and necessary work." The second directed and urged the missionaries working among the black populations to assist the masters and mistresses in the carrying out of the instructions given in the former letter, in their several parishes.

South Carolina.

Dr. Le Jean, an outspoken missionary of the S.P.G. in South Carolina, where the slave population was very numerous, also wrote in the earlier part of the century a letter which shows what need there was of such exhortation. Soon a better state of things generally prevailed. The report of 1741 says that some thousands of

negroes were converted. In North Carolina the difficulties were of a special character. It was desolate and thinly peopled, and had long been entirely neglected by the Church and left to the Quakers, who strongly resented the introduction of Church teaching. But even in this missionary field good Church work was at last done among the blacks as well as among the whites. North Carolina had the advantage of the services of a most distinguished man in the Church in the American colonies, Clement Hall, who writes in 1752: "I have now, through God's gracious assistance and blessing, in about seven or eight years, though frequently visited with sickness, been enabled to perform (for aught I know) as great ministerial duties as any clergyman in North America, viz. to journey about 4000 miles, preach about 675 sermons, baptize about 3783 white children, 243 black children, 57 white adults, and about 112 black adults; sometimes administer the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to 200 or 300 communicants in one journey, besides churching of women, visiting the sick, etc." In North, as well as in South Carolina the preaching of the Gospel both to the negroes and to the Indians was an appointed part of a S.P.G. missionary's work, but he was hindered in the latter by the planters' oppressive treatment of the Indians. To the high character of the clergy in Carolina we have the testimony of John Wesley when he was in the neighbouring colony of Georgia. He says that among them "in the afternoon there was such a conversation for several hours on 'Christian Righteousness' as he had not heard at any visitation, or hardly on any other occasion." North Carolina.

But the work of the Church of England among blacks, reds, and whites alike was abruptly put a stop to, so far as a great part of North America was concerned, by the breaking out of the War of Independence. The less the Church entangles itself with secular politics the better for its spiritual work. But this case, like that of the Non-Jurors in Great Britain eighty years before, was not one so much of politics as of conscience. Jonathan Boucher, a distinguished clergyman, who afterwards became Vicar of Epsom, Surrey, expressed the views of many when he declared boldly, in a sermon preached during the height of the hostility War of Independence.

against England, that conscience and inclination alike would keep him loyal to the King. This was the line taken by all the missionary clergy sent out by the S.P.G. The oath of allegiance was the insuperable difficulty. The clergy had at their ordination sworn perpetual allegiance to the King, and the oath was recorded not only in the books of the Bishop of London, but also on the invisible tablets of their own consciences. Charles Inglis, afterwards Bishop of Nova Scotia, took exactly the same line as Boucher. He held a prominent position as Rector of Trinity Church, New York, and when George Washington, who was a strong churchman, occupied the city, one of his officers sent a message to Inglis that General Washington would be at church and would be glad if the "violent prayers" for the King and the Royal Family were omitted. It is doubtful whether Washington himself was responsible for the message, but at any rate Inglis took no notice of it, and meeting Washington soon afterwards, told him that he might if he pleased shut up the church, but he had no power to make the clergy depart from the path of duty—a remark which Washington, to his credit, took in good part. Some few clergy were on the other side, but the majority of the clergy were loyal, as also were the Methodists under the influence of Wesley.

Wesley's *Calm Address.*

His *Calm Address to the Americans*, in which, with his usual power and lucidity, he laid down fundamental principles, would, he knew, be unpalatable to the greater body of the colonists, and did, as a matter of fact, evoke strong expressions of feeling against him, not only in America but also on this side of the Atlantic.

Where, as in Virginia and Maryland, the Church was established and endowed, it was at once disestablished and disendowed. Where it was worked through the missionaries of the S.P.G., it ceased to be worked. The Society by the terms of its charter was bound to withdraw all its stipends when the Declaration of Independence was promulgated. In a word, "the Church of England in America" ceased to exist, and after the Peace reappeared as "the American Protestant Episcopal Church," in which character it belongs to the next and not to the present chapter.

The S.P.G. did noble work under the most discouraging

conditions and amid difficulties of the most various kinds. When it began its work in America it found but five churches; when it closed it, three-quarters of a century later, it left two hundred and fifty. It raised the clerical type throughout the colonies, for while apart from it the clerical standard was not high, and the name of clergyman was not in good odour, the general character of the S.P.G. missionaries was good, and some were distinctly eminent, not only for earnestness and activity, but for abilities and attainments. It awakened a sympathy for people of poor despised races, both native and imported, who had too often been treated as if they had no souls, and who at times were cruelly oppressed. And all this with very scant encouragement from the powers that be, both at home and abroad; for the Colonial authorities, with rare exceptions, must take their full share of the blame. This does not apply to the rulers of the Church at home. The bishops, especially the successive bishops of London, showed strong sympathy, and did everything they could, except the one thing which they alone could do, and without which the Church's system could not possibly be carried out. They over and over bitterly regretted their inability to grant the boon of the colonial episcopate. It would have been an heroic, in other words, an Apostolic, thing to do, if they had done it and faced the consequences; but no one who is really acquainted with the mind of the eighteenth century will expect them to have done it. It is a dangerous thing to assert a negative, but we may safely say that in the voluminous literature of the eighteenth century there cannot be found a single hint of this method of cutting the Gordian knot. The Church was too subservient to the State for any churchman to dream of bidding defiance to it. The only attempt in this direction was made by an irregular offshoot of the Non-Jurors, when John Talbot, an old and devoted missionary of the S.P.G., and Dr. Welton, formerly a rector of Whitechapel, were supposed to be consecrated by Ralph Taylor alone, in or about 1722. But the consecration, if it took place—the whole affair is shrouded in mystery—was never recognised as a regular one by the Non-Jurors themselves, much less by the National Church, and it is doubtful whether Talbot and Welton performed any episcopal functions.

S.P.G.

Sixty years later John Wesley, who himself never professed to be a bishop, pretended to confer a sort of episcopal authority in America on Coke, who was in the same position ecclesiastically as himself. Both these proceedings only show how crying was the need of an episcopate, not how it could be supplied.

Short of taking the matter into their own hands, the English bishops seem to have done their very best to meet the emergency. Bishop Butler, for instance, carefully drew up in 1753 an elaborate *Plan for introducing Episcopacy into North America*. "It consisted," writes his first biographer, Bartlett, of "four Articles, all wisely calculated to prevent or allay anti-episcopal jealousy," and an examination of the Articles fully bears out the assertion; but the bare rumour of it was received with extreme alarm by dissenters in the colonies. His friend, Archbishop Secker, revived and advocated the same scheme nearly twenty years later, but only succeeded in raising violent hostility against himself. "Posterity," writes his biographer, Bishop Porteus, "will stand amazed when they are told that on this account his memory has been pursued in pamphlets and newspapers with such unrelenting rancour, such unexampled wantonness of abuse, as he could scarce have deserved had he attempted to eradicate Christianity out of America, and to introduce Mahometanism in its room; whereas the plain truth is that all he wished for was nothing more than what the very best friends of religious freedom ever have wished for, a complete toleration for the Church of England in that country." Butler also left £500 to the S.P.G. for the purpose, and that the three friends might be joined in this as they were in so many matters, Bishop Benson also bequeathed to it such a legacy as he was able, "to be added to the fund for settling bishoprics in America"; hoping "that a design so necessary and unexceptionable cannot but at last be put into execution." None of the three was ever Bishop of London, and was not, therefore, officially interested in the subject. Secker was especially interested in the Church in America generally, and the supply of bishops in particular. In his *Answer to Dr. Mayhew's Observations*, he clearly limited the functions of the proposed bishops. It was not

Scheme for Colonial Episcopate.

"desired in the least that they should hold courts to try matrimonial or testamentary causes, or be vested with any authority, now exercised either by provincial governors or subordinate magistrates, or infringe or diminish any privileges and liberties enjoyed by any of the laity, even of our own communion." The dissenters would have an insupportable grievance if they were to be placed in a like position and not be able to develop their own systems, and Secker plainly declared that if such were to be the case, he would be a zealous advocate for giving them the full toleration which they by their present action were denying to us. In 1764 he revived, as we have seen, Butler's scheme, and in 1765 he gallantly took up arms in defence of East Apthorpe, a missionary at Cambridge, Massachusetts, who had been attacked by Mayhew, for a pamphlet advocating, among other things, the appointment of bishops. Indeed, the bishops in England generally cannot be accused of a want of sympathy with the painful position of their fellow-churchmen across the Atlantic.

When it is said that after the war the S.P.G. ceased to make grants to the Church in America, this, of course, only applies to what then became the United States. There was still a vast population and a vast territory in that continent and the adjacent islands which both required and received its aid. Moreover, it had always helped what were then called the factories, or settlements of combined trades. And as its resources were very limited, it had more than enough on its hands. There was, then, ample room for another society to relieve, rather than to rival, the venerable one which had borne the burden and heat of the day. Such a society arose towards the close of our period, and as the Evangelicals were then fast becoming the most potent spiritual force in the kingdom, it is not surprising that it should have arisen under Evangelical auspices. The deep interest which the Evangelicals took in the abolition of the slave trade led them to turn their attention to Africa, whence the negroes were imported. Africa had not been entirely neglected by the older Society. About the middle of the century a devoted missionary in New Jersey, Thomas Thompson, who had been Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and had sacrificed his prospects at home for the cause of

Africa.

Christ, reminded the Society of their obligation to care for the despised Africans, and suggested that they should extend the ministrations of the Church to Africa itself. If the Society would appoint him to the Mission, he would gladly undertake its duties.

Africa was then a *terra incognita* to the Christian missionary, and it was a post not only of difficulty but of danger to which he aspired. But he did not shrink from it, and in 1751 landed upon the coast of Guinea as travelling missionary for the Society among the negroes. He discharged his duties faithfully for six years at a stipend of £70 a year, when sickness forced him to resign, and the Society wisely determined to settle a native clergyman on the coast of Guinea. But one had to be trained for the purpose, and this took time. The native selected was Philip Quaque, a wise selection as it proved. He was sent to England to be educated, was admitted to holy orders in 1765, returned to Africa in 1766, nine years after Thompson had resigned, and for more than fifty years performed most diligently the duties of missionary of the Society and chaplain to the Factory at Cape Coast Castle. But one clergyman, however active and efficient, in such a sphere, was a mere drop in the ocean. There was therefore ample scope for a new Society to work in Africa, and indeed the name by which it was first known is "The African Institution," or "The Society for Missions in Africa and the East," the West being the special province of the S.P.G.

The Church Missionary Society was the outcome of an agitation that had been going on for some time. In 1783 the Eclectic Society formed in London "for religious intercourse and improvement," made a special exception to its strict rule against the admission of visitors in favour of missionaries. In 1786 it proposed and discussed the following question, "What is the best method of planting and propagating the Gospel in Botany Bay?" On February 6, 1789, the discussion was on the question, "What is the best method of propagating the Gospel in the East Indies?" In 1791 (October 14 and November 7), "What is the best method of propagating the Gospel in Africa?" In 1795 the London Missionary

Church Missionary Society.

Society was formed, in which the Evangelical clergy joined with dissenters; but the union was not satisfactory, the clergy holding that "their missionary operations ought to be carried on in direct connexion with, and under the sanction of the Church to which they belonged." In the same year, May 6 and 7, 1795, an important advance was made at a clerical meeting held at Rauceby, in Lincolnshire, where the incumbent, Mr. Pugh, was a leading Evangelical. Three pillars of the Evangelical cause, Thomas Robinson of Leicester, Samuel Knight of Halifax, and Charles Simeon of Cambridge, were present. Mr. Pugh announced that a sum of £4000 had been left to him by a clergyman of the name of Jane "to be laid out by him to the best advantage to the interests of religion"; and the opinion of the meeting was asked as to whether the money might be most advantageously given to any scheme then in progress, or to any new object at home or abroad? If to the latter, "the thing desirable seems to be, to send out missionaries." After full discussion it was agreed that Simeon and Robinson should consult some leading laymen such as Wilberforce and Grant. While it is true that the first idea of forming a Church Missionary Society began to take a practical form at Rauceby, the idea of making fresh efforts for the conversion of the heathen had, as we have seen, been broached many years before; and nothing definite was decided at Rauceby.

On February 8, 1796, the subject was again brought before the Eclectic Society by Simeon. A discussion arose which led to the foundation of the Church Missionary Society. But it was not till April 12, 1799, that the Society was actually formed. On that day a meeting was held at the Castle and Falcon Inn, Aldersgate Street, "for the purpose of instituting a society amongst the members of the Established Church for sending missionaries among the heathen." John Venn was in the chair, and detailed the objects of the meeting. Sixteen clergymen and nine laymen composed the meeting. To Venn, more than to any one else, the lines upon which the Society are worked are due. He had submitted them all to a meeting of the Eclectic on March 18. He suggested, among other things, that the Society should be "conducted on the Church principle, but not on the High

Church principle"; thus differentiating it from the London Missionary Society on the one hand and the S.P.G. on the other, though it was not intended to come into collision with either. Application was then made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore, who declined to identify himself with the Society, but promised "to watch its proceedings with candour." The Bishop of London, Porteus, was also cautious; but he went a step further than the primate, and promised to ordain certain young men from the Elland and other societies, who were recommended to him for missionary work, and this was perhaps as much as could be expected in those days even from a prelate with Evangelical proclivities.

Although the formation of a new society was agreed to in 1799, the Society itself was not actually established until the spring of 1801, and even then limited its functions to one quarter, and was called simply "The African Institution," or "The Society for Missions in Africa and the East." The wider title "Church Missionary Society" was not given to it till 1812. The first secretary was Thomas Scott, who also preached the first anniversary sermon, and is justly regarded as one of the fathers of the Society. But shortly afterwards he left London, and Josiah Pratt succeeded him as secretary.

The lay element was always strong in the C.M.S., and from the first it received invaluable aid from William Wilberforce, Henry Thornton, Zachary Macaulay, James Stephen, Thomas Babington, Granville Sharp, the three Grants, and other prominent evangelical laymen. Most of these, we may observe in passing, were also instrumental in founding the British and Foreign Bible Society a few years later. It is worth remembering how many of our now great and flourishing organisations date from the closing years of the eighteenth, and the opening years of the nineteenth century, and also how many of them were the outcome of the same united and zealous body of men. In the Church Missionary Society they had a peculiar interest because it exactly fitted in with their own favourite project, the abolition of the slave trade. For the purpose of providing for those liberated slaves, who, by the law of our land, gained freedom when they touched the British shore, and who were rather an embarrassment to their friends, a colony had been established at Sierra Leone,

chiefly through the efforts of Henry Thornton. He was assisted, of course, by others, but the scheme was his. He formed the company, collected the capital, drew up the constitution. Accordingly Sierra Leone was selected as the first field for the operations of the new Society. In some ways the choice was a desirable one, but in others an unhappy one. The climate was so unhealthy that but few Europeans could bear it. It became known as the "White Man's Grave," and many who went there to labour fell early victims to disease. Sierra Leone.

The Church of England had always recognised its duty both to supply the means of grace to the British residents in India, and also to evangelise the native races. But in both of these departments it had been checked by causes over which it had no control. In 1786 a Cambridge graduate, named David Brown, went to Bengal as a chaplain under the East India Company. He was placed in charge of a large orphan-house at Calcutta, was appointed chaplain to the Brigade at Fort William, and had charge of the Mission Church. In 1794 he was made presidency chaplain, and in these various spheres he acquired great influence in Calcutta and the neighbourhood, which was enhanced by the respect felt for his personal character. He had been educated first at the Grammar School, Hull, under Joseph Milner, and then at Magdalene College, Cambridge, a stronghold of Evangelicalism. He was deeply influenced at Cambridge by Charles Simeon, though it does not appear that Simeon was the means of his obtaining the Indian chaplaincy. But just about the time when Brown went out to India, Simeon did begin to exercise a great, almost a paramount influence in the appointment of East India chaplains. A strong Evangelical element began to be infused into the directorate of the East India Company, which was chiefly due to the Grants, one of whom is said by Lord Macaulay to have afterwards "ruled India from Leadenhall Street." In 1787 an address was sent to Simeon, signed by David Brown, Charles Grant, and two others, asking him to become "the agent at home for a projected mission to the East Indies." The scheme fell through, but from that time forward the appointment of East India chaplains was virtually India. David Brown.

in the hands of Simeon for several years, and the Evangelical element in India was still further strengthened when Sir John Shore, afterwards Lord Teignmouth, succeeded Lord Cornwallis as Governor-General. Chaplains suited Simeon's purpose better than avowed missionaries, for missionaries were in some quarters looked upon with suspicion, and had no such definite status as that which chaplains in the East India Company's service enjoyed. Meanwhile, William Wilberforce was doing his part at home in his own sphere. In 1793 he succeeded in passing a resolution in the House of Commons to the effect that, it was the duty of the legislature to adopt such measures as may tend to the advancement of the British dominions in India in useful knowledge, and religious and moral improvement, and that sufficient means of religious worship and instruction should be provided for all persons of the Protestant Communion in the service and under the protection of the East India Company, proper ministers being from time to time sent out from Great Britain for these purposes. This resolution, however, remained nugatory, the Company successfully opposing any practical effort to carry it out. In 1797, the Company's Court of Directors issued an order for building churches in the Presidency of Bengal. But this order lay dormant for twenty years.

Almost at the end of the eighteenth century Lord Wellesley had founded a college at Fort William, intended, according to Dr. Buchanan "to enlighten the oriental world." Of this college David Brown was made provost and Claudius Buchanan vice-provost in 1800. And Buchanan wrote later to the Archbishop of Canterbury that "Our hope of evangelising India was once founded on the College of Fort William."

AUTHORITIES.—On colonial and missionary work generally the *History of the Church of England in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies of the British Empire*, by James S. M. Anderson, 3 vols., 1856, is an indispensable guide. *The Digest of S.P.G. Records*, 1701-1892, gives much first-hand information. The *Life of Bishop Seabury* and Dr. S. M'Connell's *History of the American Episcopal Church* are very full and accurate. But the story of the American Episcopate is best gathered (1) from William White's *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States*, edited by B. F. de Costa, 1880; and (2) from the recent monograph (*Harvard Historical Studies*, vol. ix.) "The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies," by Arthur Lyon Cross. Dr. Cross has

examined and published many documents preserved at Fulham Palace and elsewhere, which were before unknown. Sabine's *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists*, 2 vols., Boston, 1864, may also be consulted with advantage. The history of the C.M.S. has been written by Mr. Eugene Stock in the Jubilee volume. See also the *Memoirs of the Missionary Secretariate of Henry Venn*, by Wm. Knight; and *Eclectic Notes*, edited by Pratt. A full account of Dr. Jonathan Mayhew and of the movement he represented will be found in *The Literary History of the American Revolution*, 1763-1783, by Professor Moses Coit Tyler, 2 vols., 1897.

CHAPTER XXI

RELATIONS WITH SISTER CHURCHES

The English Church was never in a more isolated position than she was in the eighteenth century, and this isolation increased rather than diminished as the years rolled on. It might perhaps have been thought that the lack of definite Church teaching, which was so painfully characteristic of the period, would have been favourable to the cultivation of sympathy with other Christian communities, but it may be doubted whether this is ever the case, either with individuals or with churches. At any rate it certainly was not the case with the English Church in the eighteenth century. The events of the previous two centuries had all tended to cut her off from the rest of Christendom. The final breach with Rome in the sixteenth had, of course, separated her from all those who remained in the Roman obedience. Archbishop Wake, as we have seen, made a laudable attempt to promote a sort of union with the Gallican Church. The Non-Jurors made overtures to the great Church of the East. But both those schemes fell through, and before the middle of the century the Church of England was left high and dry, and had very little sympathy with anything outside its own "happy Establishment." The present chapter will therefore be a short and barren one, but the subject is too important to be entirely omitted.

It is perhaps rather euphemistic to speak of the relationship between the Churches of England and Ireland in the eighteenth century as an intercourse of sister churches.

They were, theoretically at least, independent churches, and must be treated therefore as sisters. In one country the Church included the great majority of the nation, in the other only a small minority; in one it was of national growth, in the other it was the Church of the foreigner, not of the nation. And it must be owned that the behaviour of her more powerful sister across the Channel towards the Irish Church, especially in the eighteenth century, greatly tended to emphasise the difference. The whole policy of England towards Ireland had always been to make the Church one of its chief instruments in maintaining the Protestant ascendency. The Roman Catholics had been cruelly treated, and the cruelty reached its climax in the penal code begun in the time of William and finished in that of Anne, which placed four-fifths of the people under a ban. No interest suffered in one sense more severely than the Church itself. In fact the legislature did its very best to make the Church it meant to protect, disliked equally by Roman Catholics and Presbyterians.

The Church of Ireland.

It has been seen that in the colonies the great obstacle to all real Church work was the want of bishops. In Ireland it was just the reverse. There were too many bishops, far more than were required for their proper work in the Church. Even in point of area the Irish dioceses stood to English in the proportion of about thirteen to eight; in point of the whole population of about two to one, and in point of the Church population of at least twenty to one. The last thing the British Government thought of doing was of diminishing the number of bishops. The Irish episcopate was far too valuable politically for that. The appointment to Irish bishoprics was vested in the Crown; and the Crown, that is, of course, the Ministry, used its power unblushingly for purely political purposes. When George Grenville offered the primacy of Ireland to Bishop Newton, he told him plainly that "he should expect him always to be one of the Lords Justices, constantly to correspond with him, and to give him constant intelligence of everything material; he should rely upon his advice as upon a friend on whom he could repose the greatest trust and confidence." The bishops all had seats in the Irish House of Lords, and as there were twenty-two of

Irish bishoprics.

them, and they were not overburdened with other work, they attended regularly, and often outvoted the temporal peers. They were distinctly expected to vote for the King's Ministers, and they rarely disappointed the expectation. An Irish bishopric was frequently found a convenient means of providing for a supporter who could not so easily be provided for in England. Men who were thought too heterodox to be advanced to the English Bench were not thereby disqualified for the Irish.

Men of high social position were quite ready to accept these offices, for they were not shackled by over much responsibility. If they voted straight and lived decently, they could do pretty much what they pleased. They might, as some of them did, spend a considerable portion of their time in London or Dublin, where they contributed a pleasant element to society. If they had a literary turn of mind, they had ample leisure for exercising it; and some of them employed their talents that way in making contributions of considerable value to theological literature, especially to the controversial divinity of the day. Thus Leslie, Berkeley, and Peter Browne wrote against the Deists; Archbishop King produced a once famous work on the *Origin of Evil*; and there were others. If they were high-minded, honourable gentlemen, they had time and means for doing a world of good in the Church and nation of their adoption, and here again they were certainly not found wanting. But since the interest of the history of the Irish Church during our period is almost wholly political, it is not necessary to enter further into it.

The Union.

In 1800 the two sister churches became one so far as Parliament could unite them; for it is characteristic of the times that the spiritualty was not in any way consulted when the union of the two countries was accompanied by the union of the two churches, effected simply and solely by the secular power. The Act of Union ordained that "the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law established, be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church to be called 'the United Church of England and Ireland'; and that the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the said United Church shall be and shall

remain in full force for ever, as the same are now established for the Church of England; and that the continuance and preservation of the said United Church, as the Established Church of England and Ireland, shall be deemed and taken to be an essential and fundamental part of the Union."

If politics were a bar to friendly intercourse with Ireland, still more were they so with Scotland. The dynastic question created little difficulty in the former case, but raised an insuperable one in the latter. In the former there were hardly any Jacobites; in the latter the population was largely Jacobite. Several causes led to this result. Scotland was the home of the Stewarts. The establishment of Presbyterianism by William III. naturally alienated episcopalians from him. But after the death of Queen Anne all was changed. The Scottish Episcopalians would not accept George I., and there is no doubt that they were largely involved, clergy and laity alike, in the Rebellion of 1715. After this, friendly intercourse was almost exclusively confined to the Non-Juring section of the English Church. This intercourse became closer and more frequent when the "usages" controversy broke out among the English Non-Jurors in 1718; not indeed at first, for Bishop Rose, the Scottish Primus, was a wary man, and declined to identify himself, or the Church of which he was the undoubted leader, with the disputants on either side across the border. But after his death in 1720, they at once plunged into the dispute.

Scotland.

The way had been prepared for it some time before by the action of two Scottish bishops, who were much more connected with the English Non-Juring Church than with their own. These were Archibald Campbell and James Gadderar. The former was a scion of the noble house of Argyll, but entirely broke off from the family traditions, which were Whig and Presbyterian, and became a strong Jacobite and an advanced churchman. Though he was consecrated by Bishops Rose, Douglas, and Falconer, as a bishop "at large" (that is, without a diocese), he lived almost entirely in London, both before and after he became a bishop in 1711, and even after he had been elected in 1721 by the clergy of Aberdeen as their diocesan. In fact he never seems

Archibald Campbell.

to have visited his titular diocese at all, but remained in London until his death in 1744. The reason for his remaining in England is said to have been in order that he might gather together contributions in that richer country for his poor distressed church in Scotland. But he thoroughly identified himself with the English Non-Jurors, helped to consecrate four of their bishops in the regular line, and then started an irregular line of his own, because even the "usages" did not go far enough for him. He is best known as the author of *The Doctrine of the Middle State between Death and the Resurrection*, and for his negotiations with the Eastern Church. In 1717 he made the acquaintance of Arsenius, metropolitan of Thebais and, along with many of the Non-Juring clergy, opened up communication with a view to union with the Orthodox Church. Arsenius conferred with the Emperor of Russia, Peter the Great, who was favourably inclined to the proposal. But it was found impossible to come to any lasting agreement with reference to certain points of difference, and the negotiations were broken off.

The other was James Gadderar, who, having in earlier days been one of the "rabbled ministers" in the diocese of Glasgow, settled with Campbell in London as a Non-Juring clergyman. He, too, was consecrated a bishop "at large" in Scotland in 1712, the English Non-Juring Bishop Hickes taking part in the consecration. Gadderar took part in the consecration of three English Non-Jurors to bishoprics in 1716, but in 1721 his friend Campbell, on his election to the bishopric of Aberdeen, appointed Gadderar as his vicar. Gadderar undertook the office, and executed it so well that in 1725 the clergy recognised him as their regular bishop, and in the same year he also accepted the bishopric of Moray, and worked both dioceses most effectively. The controversy about "usages" in England had a special interest for the Scots, because most of the usages in question were found in the Scottish liturgy, though not in the English as finally revised. But the English Non-Jurors gradually dwindled away, and so the bond of union with the English Church was slowly broken, though we find traces of it lingering on. Thus in 1744 the intervention of one of the later Non-Juror bishops

James Gadderar.

in England, George Smith, was called in to arbitrate in a dispute among the Edinburgh clergy who were discontented with the action of the bishops in issuing canons without consulting their presbyters. His interference was irregular, for the English Non-Jurors had no status in the Scots Church, but, on the other hand, he had in more ways than one been very closely connected with the Scots, and especially with the Scottish bishop, John Gillan; and the last of all the bishops in the regular line, Robert Gordon, shortly before his death in 1779, solemnly commended his little flock to the care of the Scottish Episcopal Church in a touching letter addressed to "The Primus and his Colleagues of the Church of Scotland."

The English Church cannot be held to blame for the cruel laws which were enacted against her Scottish sister after the Rebellion of 1745. These laws were far more severe than those passed after the Rebellion of 1715, and they were passed under far less provocation. For Scottish episcopalians had taken part in the former, but not as a body in the later rebellion. English bishops protested in the House of Lords against the measure; indeed they could hardly fail to do so; for the legislature not only took upon itself to cripple the energies of the Church in Scotland, but actually to unchurch it. The Act of 1748 enacted that no letters of orders not granted by some bishop of the Church of England or Ireland should be sufficient to qualify the pastor or minister of any episcopal meeting-house in Scotland, thus denying the validity of the letters of orders of the Scottish bishops altogether. After the accession of George III. these laws were, through the intervention of the new King, less rigorously enforced. Nevertheless the Scottish Church still continued in a very depressed state. In 1784 it became better known through the service it rendered by the consecration of Bishop Seabury, which will be noticed later. It had always had the sympathy of well-informed churchmen in England like Dr. Horne and Dr. Routh; and English churchmen as a body now became more awake to the fact that there was a pure episcopal Church across the Tweed, with which she ought to be in full communion, and of which Dr. Horne said in his racy way to his

The Act of 1748.

friend Jones of Nayland, that he thought that if the great Apostle of the Gentiles were upon earth and it were put to his choice with what denomination of Christians he would communicate, the preference would probably be given to the episcopalians of Scotland as most like to the people he had been used to, and that because of the primitive orthodoxy, piety, poverty, and depressed state of the Church. There was, however, still in England an amazing ignorance of the episcopal church in Scotland, which was illustrated when Lord Chancellor Thurlow, though the brother of a bishop, asked in the House of Lords if there were any bishops in Scotland, and was answered by Bishop Horne, "Yes, better bishops than I am."

The Episcopal Church in Scotland.

There was one objectionable feature in the relations between a small section at least of the English Church with her Scottish sister. When the latter was under a ban, through the Act of 1748, some English clergymen improperly ignored the Scottish bishops and officiated in Edinburgh and other places, substituting, in short, a sort of English Church in Scotland for the true Scottish Episcopalian Church. This was nothing less than a schismatical act, and this irregular course was unfortunately pursued long after that faint shadow of excuse, that otherwise episcopalians would have no church services at all, was removed. Nor was the Scottish Episcopalian Church allowed to hold full communion with the English Church; for though the Toleration Act of 1712 removed the iniquitous barrier against clergy ordained by Scottish bishops officiating in Scotland, it was not until many years later that they were allowed to officiate in England. Better days dawned towards the end of the century, and in 1792, after the death of Charles Edward, an Act was passed giving full toleration to the Scottish Episcopalian Church on the condition that prayers were said for the King and that the oaths of allegiance were taken.

In the treaty which England made with the United States in 1783, she entirely ignored those unfortunate churchmen, the great majority of whom had been loyal to her in the contest and had suffered severely for their loyalty. The Church as a

Colonial Church was gone, but it rose in another shape as the American Episcopal Church. After various tentative efforts and amidst innumerable difficulties, the episcopal Church in America was at last organised. England had lost a golden opportunity of settling the Colonial Church on a proper basis by conferring on it an episcopate. To have boldly defied the State when the American colonies were ours would have been heroic ; to have done so after the Declaration of Independence would have been quixotic. There is, indeed, another point of view from which the question might be regarded, which is well presented by the American clergy in their letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They fully recognised the necessity of some alterations in the Liturgy owing to changed conditions. Prayers for the King and Royal family and offices belonging to such days as November 5 must be omitted. Many of the canons had become obsolete. Nevertheless, the changes made must be as few as possible, and uniformity throughout the States must be maintained. The presence of bishops was indispensable, for without them the presbyters could not act. There was danger of the congregations becoming simply so many independent churches, with varying beliefs and ritual.

The Church in America.

It was quite in accordance with the fitness of things that the English churchman who showed the most persistent activity and the warmest sympathy in the effort to procure the consecration of the first American bishop should be George Berkeley, the son of that George Berkeley who sixty years before had sacrificed so much for the Church in America. The Church in Connecticut had elected Samuel Seabury as bishop, and requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate him. This was refused. Accordingly Berkeley wrote to Bishop Skinner of Aberdeen in 1782 and 1783, urging that the Scottish bishops should give the necessary consecration, since they were not hampered by considerations of State policy and difficulties connected with the Royal Supremacy oath. Bishop Skinner replied very naturally, "I should be glad, only he [Dr. Seabury] has been refused consecration in England." The reasons given are strangely insufficient. The bishops in England did not understand the character of the episcopate which the

George Berkeley.

American Church desired. They demurred to the want of proper support to enable the dignity of the office to be kept up, and they foretold that the office would fall into contempt for lack of it. They dreaded lest their action should be construed as unfriendly to the new government in America, and were not satisfied that, even if they did consecrate Seabury, Connecticut would receive him as bishop. Seabury's appeal to the Scottish episcopate was not in vain. He was consecrated Bishop of Connecticut in Bishop Skinner's private chapel in Aberdeen on November 14, 1784, the consecrators being Robert Kilgour, Arthur Petrie, and John Skinner. A covenant was entered into between Seabury and the Scottish bishops to the effect that the episcopal Church in America should not enter into communion with the intruding episcopal organisation in Scotland, and that Seabury would do all in his power to introduce the Scottish Communion office into the American Prayer Book.

Feeling of the English bishops.

That the alarms of the English bishops were groundless seems to be shown by the fact that, when less than three years later a similar application came from other parts of America and, after some necessary inquiries about their orthodoxy, two American bishops, William White and Samuel Provoost, were consecrated at Lambeth on February 4, 1787, no ill consequences followed. For in 1786 an Act had been passed empowering the archbishops to consecrate to the office of a bishop persons who were subjects or citizens of countries out of his Majesty's dominions. Later, on September 19, 1790, James Madison was consecrated at Lambeth by the Archbishop and the Bishops of London and Rochester, as Bishop of Virginia. These made the canonical number of three complete, and in 1792 they consecrated Thomas John Claggett as first Bishop of Maryland.

Subsequent consecrations.

One body of Christians not falling within the same category as those already noticed remains to be mentioned as having occupied a place of some importance in the ecclesiastical legislation of the eighteenth century, and as having come into close contact with some of the leaders both in Church and State. The problem relating to them is moreover one that is not yet ultimately decided, but which stands for decision on

the programme of the next Lambeth Conference. It is therefore one of considerable interest.

In 1715 the Privy Council issued an order "for the relief and for preserving the Episcopal Churches in Great Poland and Polish Prussia." The order was granted "upon the humble petition of the bishops and clergy of the reformed Episcopal Churches, first settled in Bohemia, and since forced, by the persecutions of their enemies, to retire into Great Poland and Polish Prussia." It was obtained for them "upon a representation made to his Majesty by Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. John Robinson, Bishop of London." The King granted a general *Brief*, ordaining collections to be made in all churches in England for their relief. In consequence of this national appeal, the history, doctrine, and constitution of the Moravian Church became much better known and understood in England than formerly, and the Archbishop of Canterbury entered into a correspondence with their bishop, Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, and was so satisfied with the answers he gave to his questions that the archbishop and many of the bishops took up the cause of the Moravians with much zeal. Thomas Bennet, in a sermon preached in both London and Southwark in 1715, defended the antiquity of their church, the soundness of their doctrine, and the succession of their bishops. And later, when Count Zinzendorf was consecrated a Moravian bishop in Berlin on May 20, 1737, by four bishops, he received a letter from Potter, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

King's *Brief* for the Moravians.

"John, by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Right Rev. Count Nicholas Lewis, Bishop of the Moravian Church, sendeth greeting.

"Most sincerely and cordially I congratulate you, upon your having been lately raised to the sacred and justly celebrated episcopal chair of the Moravian Church (by whatsoever clouds it may now be obscured), by the grace of Divine Providence, and with the applause of the heavenly host: for the opinion we have conceived of you does not suffer us to doubt it. It is the subject of my ardent prayer, that this honour, so conferred, and which your merit so justly entitles you to, may prove no less beneficial to the Church, than at all times acceptable to you and yours. For, insufficient as I

am, I should be entirely unworthy of that high station, in which Divine Providence has placed me, were I not to show myself ever ready to use every exertion in my power, for the assistance of the universal Church of God; and especially to love and embrace *your* Church, united with us in the closest bond of love; and which has hitherto, as we have been informed, invariably maintained both the pure and primitive faith, and the discipline of the primitive Church; neither intimidated by dangers, nor seduced by the manifold temptations of Satan. I request, in return, the support of your prayers, and that you will salute in my name, your brother bishop, as well as the whole Christian flock, over which Christ has made you an overseer. Farewell. Given at Westminster, the 10th of July 1737."

It is to be remembered that Peter Böhler, a Moravian, accompanied John and Charles Wesley to Oxford, where he delivered addresses in Latin, which were interpreted by Gambold, who afterwards joined the Brethren, and became, along with Böhler, a bishop of the Moravian Church. For some time the members of the Moravian Society in Fetter Lane remained in connexion with the Church of England, receiving the Sacraments at the hands of its clergy, and confining their own meetings to preaching and private meetings for edification. But in 1742 a complete union between the Brethren was effected and has continued ever since. Other churches were founded in different parts of the country, in Bedford in 1745; Tytherton and Malmesbury in Wilts, 1748; Bristol and Kingswood, 1755; Leominster in 1759; and in Yorkshire, where the most important and flourishing churches were established.

Moravian foundations.

In 1747 (and here comes in the present interest) they petitioned Parliament for an Act in their favour, so that they might obtain public recognition of the claims of their Church to the free exercise of their own ecclesiastical constitution, as this alone could ensure permanency to their establishment in his Majesty's dominions both at home and abroad. This petition was granted. In 1749 a second petition was presented to the House of Commons by Oglethorpe, and leave was given to bring in a "Bill for encouraging the people known

Petition of 1747.

Act of 1749.

by the name of 'Unitas Fratrum' or 'United Brethren,' to settle in his Majesty's colonies." The Bill passed the Commons, but opposition was expected in the Lords, because one clause stated that the United Brethren was an Episcopal Church. A conference of bishops was held by Archbishop Herring, and after reading the Bill, the bishops resolved not to oppose it. At first Sherlock took a different view, but when he had read the report of the Committee, and had had an interview with Zinzendorf, he withdrew his opposition and remained a firm friend of the Brethren. The Bill became law on June 6, 1749. It acknowledged the Unitas Fratrum to be "an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church which had been countenanced and relieved by the Kings of England, his Majesty's predecessors"; it acknowledged "their doctrine to differ in no essential article of faith from that of the Church of England, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles"; and consequently, the free and full exercise of their own ecclesiastical constitution was guaranteed. A simple affirmation in the name of Almighty God was allowed to those members of their Church who had conscientious scruples against the form of an oath. A dispensation was granted to them from serving as jurymen in criminal cases, and they were exempted, under certain conditions, from actual military service in the North American colonies.

Such were the attempts after reunion and friendly intercourse with other churches in the century. The interesting approach made to the Gallican Church in 1718-19, and the correspondence between the later Non-Jurors and the Eastern Church come also under this head. Both were laudable attempts, but both came to nothing, and neither the Gallican nor the Eastern Church was really prepared to own the English as a sister Church. Perhaps in no one respect does the position of the English Church at the close of the nineteenth century contrast more favourably with its position at the close of the eighteenth than in the greater width of its horizon. It is no longer now, as then, isolated, but has thousands of Christians in full communion with it in all parts of the world.

AUTHORITIES.—For the Church of Ireland, see Vice-Chancellor Ball's *History*. The Irish bishops will be found sketched in Abbey (*op. cit.*) and

in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* For Scotland reference should be made to Overton's *Nonjurors.* The Moravian problem has been recently discussed in (1) *The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in England*, by Gerhard A. Wauer, tr. John Elliott, 1901, and (2) in the *Report of the Committee appointed by the Synod of the Moravian Church, in Great Britain, for the purpose of inquiring into the possibility of more friendly relations on the part of this Church with the Anglican Church. Adopted by the Synod of* 1903.

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL EVENTS

	A.D.
Accession of George I.	1714
The Bangorian Controversy and Silencing of Convocation	1717
Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts repealed	1719
Salter's Hill Meeting against Subscription	1719
Waterland's *Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity*	1719
Waterland's *Case of Arian Subscription*	1721
Atterbury arrested	1722
Wollaston's *Religion of Nature*	1722
Atterbury tried and condemned	1723
Collins's *Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*	1724
Butler's *Fifteen Sermons*	1726
Accession of George II.	1727
Woolston's *Credibility of Miracles*	1727
Moravian Mission planted in England	1728
Law's *Serious Call*	1729
Beginnings of Methodism in Oxford	1729
Berkeley visits Rhode Island	1729
Tindal's *Christianity as Old as Creation*	1730
Berkeley's *Alciphron*	1732
Colony of Georgia founded by Oglethorpe	1732
Hoadly's *Plain Account of the Lord's Supper*	1733
John Wesley begins work in Georgia	1735
Butler's *Analogy*	1736
Wesley returns from Georgia and is converted under Bohler	1738
Warburton's *Divine Legation*	1738
Wesley begins open-air preaching	1739
Wesley leaves the Moravians	1740
Wesley employs lay-preachers and builds chapels	1741
Predestination Controversy	1741
First Wesleyan Conference	1744
Hervey's *Meditations and Contemplations*	1745
Jones's *Free and Candid Disquisitions* on Subscription	1746
Scottish Episcopal Clergy persecuted for Jacobitism	1746
Battle of Culloden	1746
Hume's *Essay on Miracles*	1748
The Wesley *Hymns*	1748

	A.D.
Whitefield appointed Chaplain to Lady Huntingdon	1749
Butler's Durham *Charge*	1751
Change of Style	1752
Hardwicke's Marriage Act	1753
Calvinistic Controversy revived through Hervey's *Dialogues*	1755
Wesley's *Twelve Reasons against Separation*	1756
Hume's *Natural History of Religion*	1757
Accession of George III.	1760
Wesley's lay-preachers begin to administer Sacraments	1760
Venn's *Complete Duty of Man*	1763
Trevecca College founded by Lady Huntingdon	1768
Feathers' Tavern Petition	1771
Presentation of Petition to House of Commons	1772
Petition to Archbishop Cornwallis for Revision of Liturgy	1772
Outbreak of War with the American Colonies	1775
Parliament passes Resolution against the Slave Trade	1776
Repeal of Penal Laws against Roman Catholics	1778
Dissenters' Relief Act	1779
Olney Hymns	1779
Riot in Glasgow against Catholics	1779
Gordon Riots in London	1780
Raikes founds Sunday Schools in Gloucester	1780
Bampton Lectures founded	1780
Lady Huntingdon registers Spa Fields Chapel as a dissenting place of worship	1781
Priestley's *Corruptions of the Christian Church*	1782
Treaty of Peace with United States	1783
Wesley's pretended ordinations	1784
Seabury consecrated Bishop of Connecticut by Scottish Bishops	1784
Paley's *Moral Philosophy*	1785
Committee for Abolition of Slave Trade formed	1787
Paley's *Horae Paulinae*	1790
Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution*	1790
Priestley Riots in Birmingham	1791
Tom Paine's *Rights of Man*, Mackintosh's *Vindiciae Gallicae*	1791
Catholic Disabilities Act (Ireland)	1791
Penal Laws against Scottish Episcopalians repealed	1792
Hannah More's *Village Politics*	1792
Outbreak of War with France	1793
Paley's *Evidences*	1794
Paine's *Age of Reason*	1794
Watson's *Apology*	1796
Wilberforce's *Practical View*	1797
Dr. Bell establishes Schools on Pupil Teachers' System	1797
Lancaster follows Bell's Method in Education	1798
Church Missionary Society founded	1799
Religious Tract Society founded	1799

APPENDIX II

Kings.	Accession.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Accession.	Archbishops of York.	Accession.
George I. . . .	1714	Thomas Tenison . .	1695	Sir William Dawes . .	1714
		William Wake . .	1716	Lancelot Blackburne .	1724
George II. . .	1727	John Potter . . .	1737	Thomas Herring . .	1743
		Thomas Herring . .	1747	Matthew Hutton . .	1747
		Matthew Hutton . .	1757	John Gilbert . . .	1757
		Thomas Secker . .	1758		
George III. . . .	1760	Frederick Cornwallis .	1768	Robert H. Drummond .	1761
		John Moore . . .	1783	William Markham . .	1777

INDEX

Abbey, C. J., 3
Abjuration, oath of, 214
Adam, Thomas, of Winteringham, 137, 140, 145-147
Africa, 339-343
Alciphron, 5, 52-55, 319
Allegiance, oath of, 102, 336
Allen, Ralph, 167, 272
Alliance of Church and State (Warburton), 228
Altar, 288. *See also* Butler, Bp.
America, Church in, 8, 121, 123, 308-339, 352-354
American Protestant Episcopal Church, 336, 352-354
American Rebellion, 8, 86, 186, 224, 265, 277, 329, 335-336
Amusements, popular, 64, 65, 249
Anabaptists, 91
Analogy (Butler), 5, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42-47, 55
Andrews, W., and the Mohawks, 332
Anne, Queen, 1, 11, 12, 28, 59, 60, 63, 135, 273, 308, 318, 347
Antigua, 330-331
Antinomianism, 174, 176-177, 191, 206
Anti-subscription movement, 6, 208-211, 219. *See also* Creeds
Apocrypha, 192
Apologetics, 1, 5, 72-73
Apthorpe, East, 339
Arbuthnot, John, 313
Architecture, 287-288
Arianism, 3, 5, 27, 32, 33, 92, 206-207
Arian subscription, 209
Aristotelianism, 2, 312
Arminianism, 140, 148, 174, 177, 231
Arsenius, of Thebais, 350
Articles, the Thirty-nine, 208, 212, 357
Ascension Day, 293
Ashburnham, Sir William, 159
Ashbury, Francis, 230
Ashton, John, 179
Ash Wednesday, 296
Atheism, 264
Atkinson, Miles, 243
Atterbury, Francis, Bp. of Rochester, 5, 21, 60-63, 125, 156, 313
Austen, Jane, 201

Babington, Thomas, 342
Bacon, Lord, 45
Baker, Thomas, 59
Ball, Hannah, 300
Bamborough Castle, 274-275
Bampton, John, 281
Bangorian Controversy, 5, 15-18, 103, 105
Baptism, 150, 212
Barbadoes, 330
Barclay, Henry, 332
Barnard, Thomas, 146
Barnstaple, whippings at, 66
Barnville, Peter, 197
Barrell, Proctor in Convocation, 17
Barrington, Shute, Bp. of Durham, 254, 258, 259
Barton, Philip, 111
Basket, John, 211
Bassett of Glentworth, 146
Beach, John, 329
Beadon, Bp. of Bath and Wells, 248
Beauvoir, chaplain at Paris, 24
Behmen, Jacob, 138
Bell, Andrew, 303-304

Bennet, Thomas, 157, 355
Benson, Bp. of Gloucester, and Queen Caroline, 71 ; life, 107-111 ; friendship with Butler, 114, 119 ; with Secker, 120 ; relations with Whitefield, 200, 324-325 ; and the colonial episcopate, 338 ; 6, 161
Benson of Trevecca, 86, 87
Bentham, Jeremy, 221, 225
Bentley, Richard, 32, 34, 38, 43, 49, 104, 105. See also *Philaleutherus Lipsiensis*
Bere, Curate of Blagdon, 248
Berkeley, George, Bp. of Cloyne, answers Deists, 52-55, 348 ; life, 311-312 ; his Platonism, 312 ; his theory of matter, 313 ; Dean of Dromore, 314 ; legacy from Vanessa, 315 ; Bermuda College, 315-322, 334 ; deanery of Derry, 316 ; Swift and Berkeley, 316-317 ; persuades Walpole, 318; Rhode Island, 319 ; Bp. of Cloyne, 321 ; leaves his library to Yale, 321, 327. *See also* 5, 71, 109, 353
Berkeley, George, the younger, 204, 353
Bermuda, 314-322
Bernard, Richard, 50, 51
Berridge, John, 7, 75, 76, 77, 142, 147-151, 176-177, 180, 183, 188
Bible, the, 35, 210-211, 240, 247, 260, 273, 276
Bible Society, 342
Birmingham, 202, 222-223
Bisse, Thomas, 17
Blackburne, Archdeacon, 208-211, 252
Blackburne, Abp. of York, 93, 98-99, 113
Blackhall, Offspring, Bp. of Exeter, 156
Bloomsbury, St. George's, 288
Blount, Charles, 37
Blue Stocking Clubs, 244
Blunt, J. J., 258
Böhler, Peter, 81, 356
Bolingbroke, Lord, 27, 97, 167
Bonds of resignation, 253
Borromeo, S. Carlo, 298
Bossuet, 22
Boswell, J., 169, 195, 270, 285
Boswell, Thomas, 208
Boucher, Jonathan, 335-336
Boyle, R., 197, 253
Brady, Nicholas, 294
Braithwaite, John, 330
Bray, Dr., 129, 326, 329
Brett, Dr., 15, 59
Brontë family, 148
Brougham, Lord, 234
Broughton, T., 69
Brown, David, 343-344
Brown, of Yale, 326-327
Browne, Moses, 185, 196
Browne, Peter, 348
Buchanan, Dr., 344
Bull, G., Bp. of St. David's, 31, 32
Bull, William, 186
Bunyan, 51
Burke, Edmund, 1, 8, 9, 210, 218-221, 234, 266, 281-282, 284, 285
Burnet, Bishop, 64, 156
Burney, Fanny, 249, 303
Burning of women, 65
Burton, Dr., 323
Butler, Joseph, Bp. of Durham, accused of popery, 2, 117 ; friendship with Benson and Secker, 6, 113 ; and the Deists, 42-44 ; Clarke correspondence, 43, 111-112 ; his method, 45-46 ; his pessimism, 46, 116 ; his style, 46-47 ; his impartiality, 47 ; "enthusiasm," 47-48 ; relations with Methodism, 92-93, 116 ; career, 111-121 ; Oxford life, 112 ; Bp. of Bristol, 114 ; Bp. of Durham, 114 ; character, 115 ; at Stanhope, 118 ; Durham charge, 274, 290-291, 296 ; American bishops, 338. *See also* 1, 4, 5, 39, 52, 55, 67, 71, 72, 75, 107, 109, 161, 205, 254, 256. See also *Analogy*
Bye, Deodatus, 207
Byrom, John, 84, 169, 280, 294

Cadell, Thomas, 233, 244
Calendar, alteration of, 208, 212
Calvinism, 46, 140, 143, 148, 150, 154, 173, 179, 188, 190-191, 235, 238
Cambridge, 58, 59, 194-195, 238-243, 257, 260-261, 262
Campbell, Bp. Archibald, 349-350
Caner, Henry, 329

Cannon, Robert, 17
Canons of Councils, 31
Caroline, Queen, 5, 70, 71, 95, 103, 113, 114, 122, 136, 319, 323
Carter, Mrs., 244
Carteret, Lord, 316-317
Catcott, Alexander, 204
Catechising, 64, 237, 293, 299
Catlett, Mary, 183, 187
Cecil, R., 4, 7, 191-192, 196, 197, 236-237, 238
Chamberlayne, John, 278
Chancels, 289-291
Chandler, Bp. E., 38, 40, 49, 50
Chandler, S., 40
Chaplains, domestic, 63, 64, 127, 271
Chaplains, East India, 343-344
Chapone, Mrs., 244
Charity Schools, 296, 298-299
Charlotte, Queen, 303
Chatham, Countess of, 272
Cheddar, 246-248
Chillingworth, 35
Christian Perfection, 174
Christianity as Old as the Creation (Tindal), 36, 37
Christianity not Mysterious (Toland), 35
Christ's Hospital, 208
Chubb, Thomas, 37
"Church and King," 9, 222, 280
Church and State, 13, 57, 228-229, 281-283
Church building, 13, 14, 63, 287-292
Church, class distinctions, 58-59, 270, 282; defence, 221; parties in 1737, 96-97
Church fabrics, 249, 267-268, 287-290
Church Missionary Society, 235, 306-345
Church seasons, 106, 208, 249, 252
Church services, 63, 64, 84, 92, 128, 263, 286, 292-293
City Parochial Charities Act, 157
Claggett, Bp., Thomas John, 354
Clapham Sect, 197-199, 231-235, 265
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, 31, 32, 39, 43, 45, 111-113, 119, 313
Clarkson, Thomas, 234
Clayton, John, 69
Clayton, R., Bp. of Clogher, 204, 205, 206
Clement of Alexandria, 95
Clement of Rome, 206
Clergy, social distinctions, 58-59; contempt for, 268-269; poverty of, 273; and education, 283; habits of some, 284-285
Clergy Orphan School, 208
Codrington College, 316, 330-331
Codrington, General, 330-331
Coke, Dr., 74, 230, 338
Colbatch, John, 104
Colebatch of Maryland, 326
Coleridge, S. T., 2, 256, 302
Collier, Jeremy, 59
Collins, Anthony, 37, 38, 40, 44, 48, 49, 104
Colonies, Church in, 306-345, 347
Columbia College, 327
Communions, 175, 289
Communism, 68
Concanen, M., 167
Confirmation, 99, 150, 269, 307
Congregationalists, 91, 183, 185, 310, 328-329
Congreve, William, 279
Conon, George, 144, 145
Convocation, 5; committee on Hoadly, 17-18; silenced, 18; work before it at the time, 19; constitution, 20, 89, 90, 122, 127, 308
Conybeare, Dr. J., 4, 5, 40-41, 43
Conyers, Richard, 243
Cornwallis, Frederick, Abp. of Canterbury, 87, 162, 211, 282
Corporation of Sons of Clergy, 208
Cosin, John, Bp. of Durham, 26
Cottage lectures, 186, 292
Courayer, P. F. de, 25
Court influence, 7, 12-13, 122, 128, 160-161, 303
Cowper, William, the poet, 182, 186, 188, 190, 198-202, 240, 284, 293
Crabbe, George, 282-284
Craftsman, The, 212-213
Creeds, 30, 31
Crewe, Lord, 274-275
Criminal law, severity of, 65
Crook of Hunslet, 184
Cross, the use of, in churches, 2. *See also* Bishop Butler
Crouch, of St. Edmund Hall, 239
Cruttwell, C., 130
Cutler, Timothy, 326-327

Daily Services, 63, 292-293
D'Alembert, 261
Danson, Proctor in Convocation, 17
D'Arblay, Madame. *See* Burney.
Dartmouth, Lord, 86, 184-187, 201-202
Daubeny, Charles, 254
Dawes, Sir W., Abp. of York, 28
Dead, prayers for, 26
Dealtry, William, 239
Death, Evangelicals lay stress on, 142, 155, 250
De Coetlogon, C. E., 237
Defoe, Daniel, 278
De Genlis, Madame, 303
Deism, 3, 5, 34-56, 73, 92, 103, 115, 165, 209, 264
Delamotte, Charles, 323
Delany, Mrs., 244
Derby, Earl of, 126, 127,
De Vega, Lope, 199
Digby, Lord, 197
Discipline, Church, 128, 131. *See also* Bishop Wilson.
Dissenters, 9, 11, 26, 40, 182, 188, 218-219, 222, 227-229, 249, 263, 294, 301, 325, 338-339, 341
Divine Legation (Warburton), 55-56, 164-165
Divinity of our Lord, 27. *See also* Waterland
Dixon of St. Edmund Hall, 193, 239
Doddridge, Philip, 294
Dodwell, Henry, 207
Douglas, Bp. of Dunblane, 349
Dress, 225
Drummond, Abp. of York, 149, 162
Drunkenness, 64
Duelling, 225-226
Dundas, Henry, 266
Du Pin, 24, 25
Dykes, Thomas, 239, 242, 243
Dynastic Controversy, 57-60

Earthquake, great, 105-106
Eastern Church, 5, 346, 350, 357
East India Company, 344
Eclectic Society, 340-342
Education, 263, 298-305
Elia, Essays of, 273
Elliott, E. B., 231
"Enthusiasm," 2, 47-48, 102, 116, 120, 163, 170, 272, 284
Epictetus, 257
Episcopacy, 95, 307
Epworth, 67-70, 79-80
Erastianism, 15, 21, 26, 70, 95, 256, 306
Eucharist, 274, 293
Evangelical Revival, 4, 5, 7, 46, 66, 73, 116, 136, 139-157, 170, 172-196, 210, 221, 224, 230-250, 251, 254, 257, 259, 262, 277, 289, 291, 339-345
Evidences, Christian, 258, 260. *See also* Apologetics
Executions, 65
Exorcism, 78

Falconer, Bp. John, 349
Farish, Wm., 181, 239, 243
Fasting, 249, 252
Fasts and Festivals, 237, 293, 295, 296
Fasts and Thanksgivings, public, 293-294
Fathers, study of the, 23, 26, 33, 59, 95, 97, 101, 154, 194
Feasting, 249
Feathers' Tavern Petition, 209-211, 219, 252
Feild, E., Bp. of Newfoundland, 329
Fell, Dr., 21
Fitzherbert of Tissington, 271
Fleet marriages, 297
Fleetwood, Bp. of St. Asaph, 156, 291
Fletcher of Madeley, 6, 74, 85-87, 177, 193, 302
Forbes, Duncan, 204
Forster, Dorothy, 275
Foster, Henry, 196, 238
Fowler, Thomas, of Corpus Christi, Oxford, 322
Fox, C. J., 218, 220, 225, 228, 234, 266
Fraser, Prof., 313
Frederick, Prince of Wales, 122, 123
Freethinkers, 34, 48, 52, 53, 54, 115, 177, 269, 314
French principles, 248, 253-254
French Revolution, 8, 9, 218-224, 230, 233, 262, 265, 281-282, 304
French Roman Catholic refugees, 9, 223

Friars, the, 90
Friend, Proctor in Convocation, 17
Funerals, 155, 156
Funeral sermons, 155

Gadderar, James, 349-350
Galleries, church, 175, 185, 289
Gallican Church, 5, 22-25, 346, 357
Gambling, 224, 245
Gambold, John, 69, 356
Garrick, David, 244
Gastrell, Bp. of Chester, 32, 61
George I., title to the throne, 4, 7, 11, 12, 57. *See also* 60, 126, 135, 280, 288, 291, 299, 308, 349
George II., 7, 109, 114, 122, 136, 167, 319
George III., 7, 87, 123, 161, 162, 168-170, 253, 260, 285, 295, 303
George IV. (Prince Regent), 253
Georgia, 81, 322-326
Gibbon, Edward, 258, 260, 282
Gibson, Bp. Edmund, and Walpole, 13; and the Deists, 36, 38; Mortmain and Quaker Bills, 70; early life, 99; writings, 100; preferment and character, 101, 102; nepotism, 119-120. *See also* 6, 28, 92, 96, 105, 107, 161, 179, 273, 311, 320-321, 326, 331, 334
Gilbert, Abp. of York, 148-149, 184
Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 329
Gillan, John, Bp. of Dunblane, 351
Girardin, de, 24
Gisborne, Thomas, 232-233, 239, 295
Goldsmith, Oliver, 244
Good Friday, 2, 106, 175, 252, 293, 296
Goode, William, 238, 239
Gordon, Bp. Robert, Non-Juror, 351
Gordon Riots, 214-216
Grafton, Duke of, 317
Grant, Charles, 231, 341, 343
Graves, Richard, 271-272
Gray, Thomas, 104
Green, Bp. of Lincoln, 185, 190-191
Grenville, George, 347
Grimshaw, William, 7, 147-149, 155-156, 180, 183, 188, 230
Gronovius, 94
Grove, Thomas, 193
Guardian, The, newspaper, 55, 314
Gunning, Henry, 243

Hall, Clement, 335
Hall, Westley, 69
Hammond, Curate of Trinity Church, Cambridge, 241
Handel, 187
Hardwicke, Lord, 227, 297
Hare, Bp. F., of Chichester, 7, 18, 38, 96
Hastings, Lady Ann, 279
Hastings, Lady Elizabeth, 130, 146, 278-279, 318
Hastings, Lady Margaret, 279
Hastings, Warren, 219
Haweis, Dr., 185, 195
Hayter, Thomas, Bp. of Norwich, 213
Hearne, Thomas, 97, 100
Heber, Reginald, 233
Herbert of Cherbury, Lord, 35, 37
Herring, Abp. of York, 93-94, 156, 357
Hervey, James, 69, 141-144, 179
Hervey, Lord, 96
Hewetson, Michael, 126
Hey, John, 262
High Church party, 8, 27, 58, 66, 96-97, 205, 254, 256-257, 262, 341-342
Hickes, Dr. G., Non-Juror Bp. of Thetford, 15, 41, 350
Hildesley, Bp. of Man, 136
Hoadly, Benjamin, Bp. of Winchester, 14-18, 33, 61, 103, 104, 105, 113, 121, 138, 156
Hoadly, John, Abp. of Armagh, 158
Hoare, Prince, 272
Hobbes, Thomas, 35
Hodges of Oriel, 204
Hogarth, William, 65, 288
Holy Communion. *See* Communions and Eucharist
Holy Week, 293, 296
Hopkins, John, 84, 294
Horne, A., 134
Horne, George, Bp. of Norwich, 8, 193, 203-207, 240, 245, 255, 259, 351-352
Horneck, Anthony, 74-75
Horrobin, R., 134-135
Horsley, Samuel, Bp. of Rochester, 1, 8, 240, 254-257, 259, 296, 304
Hough, Dr., Bp. of Lichfield, 21

Hume, David, 258
Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, 6, 76, 87-89, 108, 153, 162, 173, 175-177, 179, 230, 279
Huntingdon, Earl of, 108
Hurd, Richard, Bp. of Worcester, 160, 164, 168-170, 252
Hutchins, Richard, 69
Hutchinson, John, 203-204
Hutchinsonianism, 6, 203-209
Hymnody, 84, 178, 294-295, 299. *See also* Olney Hymns

Ignatius, St., 206
Imputed righteousness, 143-144
Indemnity Acts, 227-228
Independents. *See* Congregationalists
India, 343-344
Indians, American, 323-325, 331
Ingham, Benjamin, 69, 279, 323
Inglis, Charles, Bp. of Nova Scotia, 333, 336
Intellectual activity, 4, 57, 72-73, 102, 165, 262, 264
Intermediate State, 285, 350. *See also* Warburton
Ireland, 218-219, 346-349
Isolation of Church of England, 346, 357

Jablonsky, Bp. Daniel Ernst, 355
Jacobins, 266
Jacobitism, 5, 55-63, 103, 165, 179, 228, 239, 257, 281, 285, 299, 312, 328, 349
Jamaica, 331
James I., 288
James II., 22, 57-58, 179
James, the Pretender, 58, 60, 214, 280
Jane, Dr., 95
Jansenism, 24
January 30, sermons, 295
Jebb, John, of Cambridge, 211
Jebb, John, Bp. of Limerick, 256
Jerram, Charles, 239, 242
Jews, 123, 212, 227
Johnson, Samuel, of Connecticut, 204, 321, 326-329, 334
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, on William Law, 42; on Warburton, 56, 164; social status of clergy, 64; parodies Hervey, 143; compared with Isaac Milner, 195-196; Gordon riots, 215-216; on duelling, 225; friendship with Hannah More, 244; stays with Dr. Taylor, 270-271; as a churchman, 284-286; on Berkeley, 313. *See also* 1, 8, 169, 272, 281, 295
Johnson, Sir William, 333
Jollie, Timothy, 118
Jones, John, of Alconbury, 208, 211-212
Jones, Samuel, of Tewkesbury, 111, 118
Jones, Thomas, 193
Jones, William, of Nayland, 6, 8, 165, 203, 204, 206-207, 209, 240, 259, 262, 352
Jowett, Joseph, 181, 239, 243

Kay, Benjamin, 193
Keene, Bp. of Chester, 184-185
Kempis, Thomas à, 67
Kennicott, Benjamin, 245
Kettlewell, John, 240
Kilgour, Robert, Bp. of Aberdeen, 354
Kinchin, John, 69
King, Lord Chancellor, 132
King, John, 243
King, Thomas, 317
King, William, Abp. of Dublin, 348
Kirkham, Robert, 69
Knight, Samuel, 243, 341
Knox, Alexander, 91, 233
Kyrle, John, 197

Lambeth Conference, 354-357
Langley, Adam, 179
Latitudinarianism, 14, 60, 92, 96-97, 121, 256, 306
Laud, Abp., 62
Lavington, Geo., Bp. of Exeter, 75, 163
Law, Bp. E., of Carlisle, 210, 259, 262
Law, John, Bp. of Clonfert, 210, 211, 262
Law, William, his *Three Letters*, 18; answers Deists, 41-42; *Practical Treatise and Serious Call*, 66-67; influence on Wesley, 81; friendship with Sherlock, 102-103; answers Hoadly's *Plain Account*,

138; his mystical works, 138-139; influence on later movements, 139-140; condemned by Warburton, 163, 165; compared with Wilberforce, 233-234; influence on Lady Betty Hastings, 279; his schools, 299. *See also* 1, 2, 4, 5, 39, 44, 47, 59, 169, 206, 240, 254, 282, 312.
Lechler on Deism, 41
Lecky, W. E. H., 3
Lectures, 152-153, 156-157, 175, 180, 190, 241, 253, 281
Leeds, 288-289
Leibnitz, 113
Le Jean, Dr., 334
Leland, John, 40
Lent, 106, 253, 293, 294
Leslie, C., 31, 34, 59, 280, 348
Liberal churchmanship, 262. *See also* Erastianism, Latitudinarianism, Whigs
Libraries, parochial, 129
Lincoln diocese *Report*, 262-264
Lindsey, Theophilus, 300
Liturgical revision, 211-212, 252
Locke, John, 30-32, 39, 49
London Missionary Society, 340-342
Lotteries, 225
Low Church party, 96, 97. *See also* Whigs
Lowth, R., Bp. of London, 92, 164, 168, 170-172, 253, 255, 311
Lukins, George, demoniac, 78
Lux Mundi, 139

Macaulay, Lord, 343
Macaulay, Z., 231-232, 234-235, 342
Mackintosh, Sir James, 9, 220
Madison, James, Bp. of Virginia, 354
Magdalen Hospital, 208
Maistre, Count de, 26
Maitland, S. R., 194
Majendie, Dr., 302
Malthus, T. R., 272
Man, Isle of. *See* Bishop Wilson
Mandeville, Bernard, 53, 54
Manners, improvement in, 224-226
Mansfield, Lord, 169
Marriage Act, 227, 297
Marshall, Judge, 315
Marshall, Nathaniel, 157
Mary Beatrix, Queen, 179
Materialism, 313
Matthews, James, 193
Maurice, F. D., 139
Mayhew, Jonathan, 310, 338-339
Mediation, 48
Melmoth, William, 278
Messiah, The, 187
Methodism, 5, 6, 9, 66, 68, 73-79, 90-93, 121, 123-124, 137, 139-141, 161, 163, 165, 170, 176-178, 200, 203, 205-206, 210-211, 216, 221, 231, 238, 240, 256, 263, 294, 301, 330. *See also* Oxford Methodists
Middleton, Dr. Conyers, 73, 149
Middleton, Erasmus, 193
Mill, Dr John, 38
Miller, Jeremiah, 98
Miln, John, 332
Milner, Isaac, 7, 193, 194-196, 199, 239, 242-243, 256, 282, 295
Milner, John, 256
Milner, Joseph, 7, 193-194, 239, 295, 343
Milner, Mary, 195
Missions, 64, 306-345
Moore, John, Abp. of Canterbury, 206, 282, 342
Morality, low state of, 64-68; preaching of, 257
Moravians, 69, 81, 93, 98, 354-357
More, Hannah, 9, 188, 199, 221, 231, 232, 238, 244-248, 253, 254, 302
More, Henry, 2
More, Patty, 246
Moreton, William, Bp. of Kildare, 126
Morgan, Thomas, 37, 40
Morgan, William, 69
Mortmain Bill, 70
Moss, Charles, Bp. of Bath and Wells, 157
Mosse, R., 17, 18
Music, Church, 295
Mysticism, 2, 66, 138-139, 154, 157, 163, 165, 203

National Society, 303
Natural religion, 35
Negroes, 333-335. *See also* Slavery
Nelson, Robert, 32, 59, 197, 207, 276, 277, 279, 299
Nepotism, 98, 119-120, 263
New England. *See* America
Newcastle, Duke of, 158-160, 167
Newcomes, The, 231-232

Newfoundland, 329
Newman, Cardinal J. H., 194
Newton, John, 4, 7, 137, 175, 182-191, 193, 196, 197, 201, 230, 236-237, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 294-295
Newton, T., Bp. of Bristol, 160, 347
Newtonian philosophy, 203-204
Nichols, 98
Nicodemus's corner, 87
Noailles, Cardinal de, 24
Nobody's Friends, 208
Non-Jurors, 5, 26, 57-63, 92, 102-103, 165, 182, 206, 299, 312, 335, 337, 346-351, 357
Non-residence, 99, 127, 261-262. *See also* Pluralities
"No Popery," 214-216
Norris, John, 252, 262, 278
North Carolina, 335
North, Lord, 210, 214, 265, 285
Nottingham, Earl of, 28
November 5, sermons, 295, 353

Oaths, 227. *See also* Abjuration, Allegiance
Occasional Conformity Act, 227
Ogden, Samuel, 295
Ogilvie, J., 333
Oglethorpe, General, 277, 322-325, 333, 356
Olivers, Thomas, 178, 294
Olney. *See* Newton, Scott, Cowper, Unwin
Olney Hymns, 155, 187
Oratorios. See *Messiah*
Origen, 38
Overton, J. H., 3, 69
Oxford, 58, 59, 80-81, 193, 238-239, 257, 280-281, 289
Oxford Methodists, 67-69, 80-81; expulsion of the six students, 192-193, 205, 239

Paine, Thomas, 9, 220-221, 258, 260
Paley, Archdeacon W., 210, 211, 225, 228-229, 234, 254, 258-259, 262
Papal controversy, 3
Papists, 163, 192, 290. Cf. Romanism
Parkhurst, John, 204
Parr, Dr. Samuel, 222
Paterson, James, 63, 75, 292
Patristic Studies. *See* The Fathers
Paul, St., 352
Pearce, Zachary, Bp. of Rochester, 51, 159
Pelham, Henry, 103
Pennsylvania university, 327
Perceval, Lord, 314, 319, 321
Perfection, doctrine of Christian, 174
Perronet, E., 294
Perronet, V., of Shoreham, 74
Perry, Archdeacon G. G., 3
Pessimism, 97, 106, 115-116, 164-165
Peter the Great, 350
Peterborough, Earl of, 317, 322
Petrie, Arthur, Bp. of Moray, 354
Pews, 286, 289
Philelcutherus Lipsiensis, 34. *See also* Bentley
Physical phenomena, 77, 78, 83, 142, 149
Pietas Londinensis. *See* James Paterson
Pillories, 65
Pitt, William, 46, 195, 226-227, 234, 266, 282-283, 285
Platonism, 2, 33, 312
Platonists, Cambridge, 138
Pluralities, 95, 98-99, 105, 114, 120, 141, 144, 160, 167, 254
Political churchmanship, 282-283, 285
Poole, John, 302
Poole, Thomas, 302
Pope, Alexander, 62, 167, 313
Popery, 26, 57, 117, 121, 268, 280, 291, 294. *See also* Romanism
Popularity of the Church, 268-269
Porteous Riot, 204
Porteus, Bishop Beilby, and Methodism, 103, 254; liturgical revision, 211; influence of French Revolution, 223; and Lady Huntingdon, 230; the slave trade, 234; the Evangelicals, 238-239; friendship with Hannah More, 245; early life and education, 251; reforms at Lambeth parish, 252, 293; work as Bp. of London, 253-254; a pluralist, 254; on Granville Sharp, 277; on Psalmody, 294; on Church services, 296; Sunday Schools, 304-305; defends Secker, 338; attitude towards C.M.S., 342. *See also* 2, 110, 120, 259, 262, 311
Potter, John, Abp. of Canterbury, and

Methodism, 92-93, 98; education, 94; writings, 94-95; Abp. of Canterbury, 95; his politics, 97; nepotism, 98; compared with Gibson, 99-102; and the Moravians, 355-356. *See also* 6, 38, 71, 105, 107, 120
Poverty, clerical, 273
Practical View (Wilberforce), 233-234
Pratt, Josiah, 238, 342
Prayer Book, 240
Prayer Book revision, 211-212, 252
Preferment hunting, 158-160
Presbyterianism, 3, 26, 91, 111, 112, 285, 326-328, 347, 349
Preston, Viscount, 22, 179
Pretyman (Tomline), Bp. of Lincoln, 194-195, 259, 263, 282
Priestley, Dr., 9, 205, 222-223, 255
Primrose, Dr., 270
Prisons, state of, 322
Proclamation against immorality, 253
Provoost, Samuel, Bp. of New York, 354
Psalmody. *See* Hymnody
Pugh of Rauceby, 341
Puritanism, 58, 90, 148, 268

Quakers, 61, 91, 92, 227, 234, 265-266, 335
Quakers' Tithes Bill, 70, 101
Quaque, Philip, 340
Queen Anne's Bounty, 208, 278

Raikes, Robert, 300-301
Raymond, Lord Chief Justice, 38
Reason, 42, 47. *See also* Intellectual Activity
Rebellion of 1715, 19, 94, 103, 104, 308, 349-351
Rebellion of 1745, 204, 351
Reformation, 35
Relief Act of 1778, 214, 226-228
Religious Societies, 6, 74
Richardson of York, 146, 196, 243
Richardson, Thomas, 142
Robinson, John, Bp. of London, 100, 355
Robinson, Thomas, of Leicester, 196, 243, 341
Rogers, Jonathan, 317
Romaine, William, 150; early life, 151; controversy with Warburton, 151-152; London lecturer, 152-153; Rector of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, 175-177, 236-237; the Feathers' Tavern Petition, 210. *See also* 88, 148, 179, 183, 196, 238, 294
Romanism, 9, 24, 25, 35, 57, 60, 213-216, 218, 226-227, 283, 346-347
Romilly, Sir S., 65, 216
Rose, James, Primus of Scotland, 349
Rousseau, J. J., 35
Routh, Martin Joseph, 351
Royal Supremacy, 19, 288, 353-354
Rubens, 288
Rundle, Thomas, Bishop of Derry, 109
Rural deans, 109
Rutland, Duke of, 282-283

Sacheverell, Dr., 12, 27, 62
Sacramental doctrine, 84, 138, 192
Sacraments in Methodist chapels, 5, 161
St. Paul's Cathedral, 43, 102, 119, 159, 291, 297
Saints' days, 293
Satire on the clergy, 63
Savile, Sir George, 213, 215
Schism, 76, 77, 171, 230-231
Schism Act, 27, 227
Schools, 129, 246-248, 274-275
Scotland, 123, 214, 349-352
Scott, Thomas, 7, 137, 175, 178, 186, 188-191, 196, 237, 295, 342
Scott, Sir Walter, 201
Scottish Episcopalians, 8, 208, 285, 349-352
Scottish Presbyterians, 285, 349
Scriblerus Club, 318
Seabury, Samuel, 329
Seabury, Samuel, the younger, Bp. of Connecticut, 329, 351, 353-354
Secker, Thomas, Abp. of Canterbury, on the clergy, 63; and Wesley, 92; friendship with Benson and Butler, 113-114, 117; education, 118; preferment, 119-120; Oxford charge, 120-121, 289-290; on the evils of the time, 121-122; contact with the Court, 122-123, 161-162; politics, 123; on Church fabrics, 287, 289-290; as a preacher, 295; the Church in the American colonies, 310, 338-339.

See also 6, 107, 109, 111, 205, 206, 207, 252
Seed, Jeremiah, 295
Selwyn, William, 331
Serious Call. See William Law
Sermons, 64, 117, 125, 232, 240, 248, 257, 285, 293, 295-296, 299
Services, division of, 212
Seven Bishops, the, 62
Shaftesbury, Lord, 53
Sharp, Granville, 234, 265, 274-278, 342
Sharp, John, Abp. of York, 28, 156, 240, 273-274, 279, 308-309
Sharp, John, the younger, 274-275
Sharp, Thomas, archdeacon, 274-275
Shenstone, William, 272
Sherlock, Richard, 126
Sherlock, Bp. T. and William Law, 18; *Tryal of the Witnesses*, 50-51; and Methodism, 75; character, 102-103; education, 103; Master of the Temple, 104; Bishop of London, 105; on the earthquake, 106; as a preacher, 295; and the Moravians, 357. *See also* 5, 17, 33, 36, 38, 44, 52, 71, 107, 113, 161, 311
Sherlock, Dean W., 102, 103
Shirley, Lady Frances, 143
Shore, Sir John, 344
Sierra Leone, 343
Simeon, Charles, 181, 239-243, 341, 343
Skinner, John, Bp. of Aberdeen, 353-354
Skipman, Joseph, 193
Skrine, Henry, 272
Skrine, Sir William, 271
Slave trade, 219, 234-235, 247, 253, 265-266, 276-278, 282-283
Smalbroke, Richard, Bp. of Lichfield and Coventry, 38
Smalridge, George, Bp. of Bristol, 124
Smalridge, Dr., 95, 317
Smith, Bp. George (Non-Juror), 351
Smith, John, 2
Smith, Sydney, 302-303
Smithson, of Massachusetts, 326
Snape, Dr. Andrew, 17, 18
Societies for the Reformation of Manners, 225
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 208, 237, 278, 306-345
Society for Propagation of the Gospel, 208, 237, 253, 278, 306-345
Socinianism, 3, 92, 209
Sorbonne, the, 24
South, Robert, 8
South Carolina, 334-335
South Sea Bubble, 314, 318
Spa Fields Chapel, 88
Spectator, The, 299, 332
Speculum Dioceseos, 23
Spinckes, N., Non-Juror Bp., 59
Spirituous Liquors Bill, 123
Spotswood, Col., 332
Spratt, Proctor in Convocation, 17
Stackhouse, Thomas, 272-273, 303
Stage, the. *See* Theatre.
Stanhope, Dean, 156
Stanhope, Lord, 228
Steele, Sir R., 279, 299, 313-314
Stephen, James, 231-232, 234-235, 342
Stephen, Sir James, 232, 242, 249-250
Stephen, Sir Leslie, 3, 37
Sternhold, Thomas, 84, 294
Stevens, W., 1, 204-205, 207-208, 240
Stillingfleet of Hotham, 146, 196, 243-244
Stock, Thomas, 300-301
Stuart, John, 333
Subscription to Articles and Liturgy, 6; *cf.* Anti-subscription Movement
Sunday observance, 140, 148, 225, 245, 253, 296
Sunday Schools, 8, 223-224, 246-248, 252, 254, 296, 298-305
Sutton, Sir Robert, 167
Swift, Dean, 313, 315-317

Talbot, Edward, 112, 113, 119
Talbot, John, of New York, 308, 337
Talbot, Lord Chancellor, 109, 113
Talbot, William, Bp. of Oxford, 112, 113, 119
Tate, Nahum, 294
Tatler, The, 279, 332
Taylor, Jeremy, Bp. of Down and Connor, 67
Taylor, Dr., 270, 286
Teignmouth, Lord, 231

Tenison, Abp. of Canterbury, 20, 21, 95, 97, 100, 278, 309
Terrick, Richard, Bp. of London, 153
Test, sacramental, 164, 220, 227-228, 283
Thackeray, W. M., 231-232, 279, 280, 285
Theatres, 139, 202, 244, 249
Theobald, Lewis, 167
Thomas, John, Bp. of Lincoln, 146
Thompson, Thomas, 339
Thompson, William, 317
Thomson, James, the poet, 201
Thoresby, Ralph, 288
Thornton, Henry, 198-199, 231-234, 246, 342-343
Thornton, John, 180, 186-187, 197-199, 230, 240, 241, 242
Thurlow, Lord Chancellor, 352
Tillotson, John, Abp. of Canterbury, 20, 156
Tindal, Matthew, 36-37, 40-41, 44, 48, 49, 52, 53, 103, 117
Toland, J. J., 11, 35-36, 48
Toleration, 70, 88, 210, 222, 226-229, 283
Tomline, Sir George Pretyman, Bp. of Lincoln, 297. *See also* Pretyman
Tomo-chi-chi, 323
Toplady, Augustus, 140, 177-178, 211, 294
Tories, 96-97, 285. *See also* High Church
Townshend, Lord, 103
Tracts, 246
Tractarian movement, 1, 139
Trimmer, Mrs., 302-303
Trinitarian Controversy, 5, 30-34, 209, 255
Tryal of Witnesses (Sherlock), 50-51
Tyrwhit, Dr., 119-120

Uniformity, Act of, 128
Union, Act of, 348-349
Unitarians, 3, 31, 255, 264, 280, 281, 283
Universities. *See* Oxford and Cambridge
Unpopularity of clergy, 63-64
Unwin, Mrs., 190, 202, 293
Usages, Non-Juror, 349-350
Utrecht, Treaty of, 318

Validity of Anglican orders, 25
Vanhomrigh, Esther (Vanessa), 315
Vazeille, widow (Mrs. J. Wesley), 80, 83
Venn, Henry, 4, 7, 87, 88, 109, 137, 140, 148, 178-182, 188, 193, 230, 232, 240, 241
Venn, John, 181, 231-232, 235, 239, 241, 341
Venn, Richard, 109, 179
Vernon, E. V., Bp. of Carlisle, 259
Via Media, the, 26, 192
Vision, theory of, 54
Voltaire, 87, 199
Vowler of St. Agnes, 140

Wake, William, Abp. of Canterbury, his early career, 21; as author, 22-23; Bp. of Lincoln, 23; correspondence with Gallican Church, 23-25; foreign Protestants, 26; Liberalism, 27; alarm at Arianism, 27; closing days, 28. *See also* 5, 20, 33, 94, 96, 100, 156, 161, 309, 346, 355
Waldenses, 194
Walker of Truro, 75, 76, 140, 144-147, 180
Walpole, Horace (Lord Orford), 71, 99, 115, 216, 244-245
Walpole, Sir Robert, 13, 61, 70, 96, 100-101, 103, 105, 114, 287-288, 309, 318, 320-321
Warburton, William, Bp. of Gloucester, *The Divine Legation*, 55-56; controversy with Romaine, 151-152, 176; on the state of religion, 160-161; career and character, 162-171; on the *Alliance of Church and State*, 228. *See also* 5, 41, 75, 252, 282
Warton, Thomas, 318
Washington, George, 336
Waterland, Archdeacon Daniel, 1, 4, 31, 32-34, 41, 43, 67, 104, 112, 254
Watson, R., Bp. of Llandaff, 210, 211, 234, 259-262, 283
Watt, James, 202
Watts, Dr. Isaac, 118, 294
Wednesday and Friday services, 293
Wellesley, Lord, 344
Wells, Dr. Edward, 32

Welton, Dr. Richard, 337
Wesley, Charles, 6, 57, 67-70, 80, 81, 82-85, 102, 108, 137, 145, 174, 323-324, 356
Wesley, John, and the establishment, 57; the origin of Methodism, 67-70; early result of Methodism, 73; on learning, 73-74; the Methodist Societies, 74-75; separatist tendency, 75-77; physical phenomena, 78-79; early life, 79-81; Georgia, 81, 323-324, 333; conversion, 81-82; ecclesiastical position, 90-92; relations with Potter, 98; with Gibson, 102; with Butler, 116-117; and the Evangelicals, 140-141; controversy with Hervey, 143-144; Walker of Truro, 145; Grimshaw and Berridge, 148-149; the turning-point in history of Methodism, 161; relations with Lowth, 172; Calvinistic Controversy, 172-174, 176-177; his relations with Horne, 205; Popery, 216; his pretended ordinations, 230-231, 338; churchmanship, 249; Sunday schools, 301-302; the S.P.G., 323-325; *Calm Address*, 335-336. *See also* 4, 6, 89, 97, 101, 108, 124, 137, 163, 170, 179, 180, 183, 200, 203, 238, 239, 240, 263-265, 338, 356
Wesley, Samuel (the elder), 67-70, 79, 299, 323
Wesley, Samuel (the younger), 76, 83
Wesley, Susannah, 69, 79, 81
West Indies, 315-321, 330-331
Wetherell, Dr., 204
Weymouth, Lord, 197
Wheler, Granville, 276
Whigs, 96-97, 101, 281, 285, 306
Whippings, 65, 66
Whiston, Dr., 38, 39, 49, 96
White, William, Bp. of Pennsylvania, 354
Whitefield, G., 4, 6, 67, 74, 78-79, 85, 87, 91, 93, 109, 116, 137, 140, 142, 144, 145, 148, 173-174, 179, 180, 182, 183, 200, 230, 272, 324-326
Whitehall, Chapel Royal, 288
Whole Duty of Man, 181-182, 240
Wilberforce, W., 1, 46, 175, 188, 192, 193, 199, 219, 221, 230-235, 238, 239, 240, 246, 253, 254, 277, 282, 341, 342, 344
William III., 96, 306, 347, 349
Willis, Richard, Bp. of Winchester, 156
Wilson, Thomas, Bp. of Sodor and Man, 37, 71, 125-136, 137, 161, 240, 279, 299, 333
Wollaston, William, 36
Wolsey, Thomas, 283
Women, burnt, 65; whipped, 66
Woodd, Basil, 237
Woolston, Thomas, 38-39, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52
Wordsworth, William, 143, 302
Wray, Sir Cecil, 265

Yale College, 321, 326-327
Yatton, 78
Yorke, James, Bp. of Ely, 259, 282
Young, of Blagdon, 248

Zinzendorf, Count, 163, 355-356

THE END

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.
WITHDRAWN

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh*.

DL - 3 FEB 1966